

A stylized, light gray line representing the Purple Line route, starting from the top left and ending at the bottom right, with several small circles indicating stations along the way.

## Appendix I

# Section 4(f) Evaluation Materials

Correspondence and other materials supporting the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation are provided in this Appendix I.



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REGION III  
Delaware, District of  
Columbia, Maryland,  
Pennsylvania, Virginia,  
West Virginia

1760 Market Street  
Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4124  
215-656-7100  
215-656-7260 (fax)

December 8, 2011

Mr. Tom McCarthy  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Program Open Space  
Southern Land Conservation  
580 Taylor Avenue  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Subject: Purple Line, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties  
Section 4(f) Resources – Montgomery and Prince George's County Parks

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), is preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Purple Line transit project located in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland. The purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources to begin formal coordination regarding the Purple Line project and its potential effects on parks and properties within its jurisdiction.

The Purple Line would extend 16 miles, from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton, in Prince George's County. The Purple Line would connect Metrorail's Red Line (Bethesda and Silver Spring stations), Green Line (College Park station), and Orange Line (New Carrollton station). This project would provide transit options to people along the corridor, support economic development, and help address the region's air quality issues.

The attached map shows the proposed alignment, as well as park resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. As currently designed, the proposed project could potentially affect numerous park resources along the proposed alignment that were purchased or developed in part with Program Open Space funding. They are as follows:

- Rock Creek Regional Park
- New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park
- Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park- including Adelphi Manor Community Recreation Center, Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center, University Hills Neighborhood Park, and Northwest Branch Trail
- Paint Branch Stream Valley
- Anacostia River Stream Valley Park
- West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Recreation Center

As part of the coordination effort, we would like to request any relevant, available information on the identified parks - such as specific parcels that were purchased or developed using POS funds - that might be beneficial with regard to our research of these resources.

Please contact Tim Lidiak, FTA Environmental Planner (215-656-7084) or John Newton, MTA's Environmental Manager (410-767-3769) at your convenience to schedule the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance with this process.

Sincerely,



Michele Destra, Director  
Office of Planning & Program Development

Enclosure

cc: Mike Madden, MTA  
John Newton, MTA  
Leslie Roche, PMC  
Steve Hawtof, GEC  
Amanda Baxter, GEC



**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation**  
**Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**Parkside Headquarters**  
**9500 Brunett Avenue**  
**Silver Spring, Maryland**  
**Wednesday, November 21, 2012 at 1:00 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda

**1. Overview of refinements made to the Preferred Alternative since the previous meeting**

The Purple Line GEC Team provided a brief overview of the refinements made to the proposed alignment since the previous meeting. The Purple Line team proceeded to review each park, and discuss parks in terms of impact findings previously discussed. The Purple Line Team supplied agendas for use by each meeting attendee, plan sized maps illustrating anticipated impacts to each park, and photographs of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park in the vicinity of the proposed project.

**2. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings, M-NCPPC is in the process of redesigning Elm Street Urban Park. The park will be completely redesigned in the future, though no timeline was provided. M-NCPPC is overseeing the design of the park. All of the renderings of the proposed reconstructed park have been provided to the Purple Line Team. The team has been working with M-NCPPC and Montgomery County in an effort to construct access to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail in an effort to minimize any potential impacts to the park. Construction access would be through the Interim CCT. Construction impacts to the park would be minimized to the maximum extent possible.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail. The trail connection would be aerial over the transitway, where it would cross to parallel the transitway to the north. The pedestrian bridge over the transitway would be fenced within a boxed truss over the track.



**General Engineering Consultant Team**  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Requardt and Associates JV  
801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231

There were questions about the potential visual impacts of the proposed trail and transitway from Elm Street Urban Park. In the vicinity of the park, the proposed transitway would be constructed within the tunnel under the Air Rights Building. There would be walls constructed directly north of the park that would screen the view of the transitway from the park. The design of the walls would be consistent with what is proposed with the redevelopment of the Air Rights Building. The walls would end with a louver (a framed opening with movable horizontal slats for ventilation), directly west of the proposed trail connection from Elm Street Urban Park to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed through the tunnel in lieu of a trail so that patrons could access the Purple Line or Metro's Red Line. In addition, the sidewalk would serve as an alternate means of crossing Wisconsin Avenue.

A rock garden currently exists between Elm Street Urban Park and the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail. There were discussions about potentially including landscaping between the Air Rights Building and the park. The rock garden could potentially be landscaped up to the louver area. This will be further explored and will be discussed at future agency coordination meetings.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. However, if the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited.

### **3. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the proposed project would be aligned completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur in order to perform the construction of the trail and transitway. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

The design of the proposed connector trail from the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to existing Rock Creek Trail was discussed. The proposed trail connection would occur completely within Montgomery County right-of-way in an effort to minimize direct impacts to the park and natural resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. The engineering and construction of the trail was discussed and the team described why the proposed connection would work. Through the majority of the park, the proposed Capital Crescent Trail would be aligned to the south side of the proposed transitway. The trail would be constructed at a lower elevation than the transitway in an effort to preserve the viewshed within Rock Creek Stream Valley Park to the maximum extent possible. On the eastern side of the park, the trail would cross under the proposed transitway in a tunnel, where it would parallel the transitway to the north.

We revisited the previous discussion regarding potentially moving the Rock Creek Trail in an effort to reduce flooding and siltation issues that currently plague the trail. Moving the trail is not a feasible option because of the instability of slope to the south of the proposed transitway, the construction of the proposed trail and transitway and associated abutments, and the location of the Rock Creek floodplain. The M-NCPPC requested that the Purple Line Team evaluate potentially raising the trail, either by constructing a boardwalk or by some other means through the proposed project area. Elevating the trail would improve the functionality of the trail.

M-NCPPC questioned stormwater management measures within the park. Stormwater management facilities would not be constructed within the park, as this would result in an increase in impacts to park resources. As such, M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to the park and trail.

#### **4. Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park**

Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park would be evaluated as two separate parks. However, since the alignment and related issues would include the same discussion for both parks, both are included below. At the May 16, 2012 formal agency coordination meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to both Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park. However, additional discussions with other M-NCPPC and Montgomery County staff after that meeting, it was determined that additional minimization measures would need to be evaluated before M-NCPPC would concur with *de minimis* impact determinations for either park. As part of mitigation, M-NCPPC indicated that replanting would be required within the parks to replace vegetation that would be removed as a result of the proposed project. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.11 acre of property and approximately 0.36 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Stream Valley Park. In addition, the Preferred Alignment would require the acquisition of approximately 0.07 acre of property and approximately 0.24 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However, some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks.

Five-foot wide sidewalks currently exist on either side of Piney Branch Road. The proposed project would include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks to replace those that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. Montgomery County would like to construct 10-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road. M-NCPPC stated that the Sector Plan that is currently under development includes sidewalk widening to 10 feet along Piney Branch Road. The Purple Line Team indicated that while the current plans include the construction of



five-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road, some measures could be taken to prepare the proposed project area for widened sidewalks in the future. Potential measures include raising the headwalls and wingwalls associated with the proposed culvert extension by 2 ½ feet so that sidewalk widening could be accommodated without impacting the extended culvert in the future.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be restricted. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the restricted access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. In addition, there is not enough room on Piney Branch Road to construct left turn lanes without substantially impacting buildings, which would be necessary to allow for left turns on Piney Branch Road. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road. Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC stated that no left turns on Piney Branch Road would be unacceptable according to the Long Branch Sector Plan, which is currently under development. Approximately 300 to 400 people use the community center every day, so there is a need to access it. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated their opinion was that since the restricted access to and from the community center would be a direct result of the proposed Purple Line, MTA is responsible for remediating any potential impacts to access. M-NCPPC indicated that they didn't feel that all measures were thoroughly exhausted to minimize impacts to access to the Long Branch Community Center. They requested additional minimization and mitigation measures be evaluated. Suggested measures include the following:

- Further widen Piney Branch Road so that left turn lanes could be included in each direction;
- Potentially realign the entrance to the Community Center with Barron Street;
- Potentially relocate the Long Branch Community Center from its current location to the west, east of the intersection of Garland Avenue and Walden Road;
- Potentially construct an additional access road from Garland Avenue near the Long Branch Library along an existing pedestrian path. A recently reconstructed pedestrian bridge over Long Branch would need to be reconstructed to accommodate vehicular traffic; and

The construction of an additional Long Branch Community Center access road from University Boulevard to Langley Drive has been evaluated in the past by M-NCPPC and Montgomery County. However, that option was dismissed, as the access road would be through an existing residential area and would result in a significant increase in traffic within the neighborhood and affecting safety.

M-NCPPC requested that the Purple Line Team attempt to minimize tree loss within Long Branch Stream Valley Park, as the proposed limits of disturbance, as currently designed, appear to be a bit more generous than is necessary. The Team will further refine the temporary impacts, limits-of-disturbance, and tree removal within Long Branch Stream Valley Park.

The measures listed above will be further evaluated and discussed at the next meeting with M-NCPPC.

## **5. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**



For documentation purposes, this park includes Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail. The Purple Line Team verified that this would be acceptable to M-NCPPC. The park is 543 acres in size, consists of seven different units, and encompasses the Sligo Creek floodplain. The park was purchased and developed using Capper-Cramton Act funding.

The proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue in the vicinity of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. In addition, the proposed Green Trail would be constructed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.25 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 1.48 acre of temporary impacts. In addition, a 0.03 acre sliver of land currently owned by Montgomery County that abuts Wayne Avenue to the south would be conveyed to M-NCPPC for use as park. Not only will the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Realigning the existing stream would be beneficial to the park and the surrounding area, as it would alleviate these flooding issues. Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project.

Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. Mapping was presented at the meeting to illustrate proposed tree removal. Tree removal was determined as a combined result of aerial photography, engineering, and site reconnaissance to determine where trees currently exist that would need to be removed. It was determined during the meeting that WSSC is completing a lot of work within Sligo Creek. M-NCPPC will attempt to provide mapping of the stream upgrades.

The proposed access road located to the south of Wayne Avenue is currently a utility easement. This area was also used as an access road for WSSC to complete work in January 2012. Tree removal to the south of Wayne Avenue could potentially be further minimized. To the north of Wayne Avenue, parking within the park would be reconfigured and replaced as a result of the proposed project. There were concerns about potential impacts to Sligo Creek Parkway as a result of the roadway tie-ins. This had already been considered by the team, and the proposed tie-ins are relatively short.

M-NCPPC will have an internal meeting to discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. There will be further discussions between M-NCPPC and the Purple Line Team to discuss a potential *de minimis* impact finding.

## **6. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard intersection. The transitway and station construction would require roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.32 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 0.35 acre of temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.



The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store and gas station, located directly north of the park. In addition, the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Sector Plan is currently being developed for the proposed project area. M-NCPPC has expressed an interest in the identified displacement area directly to the north of the park for potential future parking. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park. M-NCPPC indicated that the sector plan that is currently under development indicates that a loop road would be constructed through the park to provide access to private property to the north of the park. M-NCPPC stated that the park would be redeveloped, regardless of the proposed project. The park will be reclassified from a neighborhood park to community use/urban recreation park. Due to so many unknowns with regard to potential impacts and mitigation, a finding for this park is pending.

## **7. Next Meeting**

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park and Rock Creek Stream Valley Park would be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process. Depending on refinements to the LOD, Long Branch Stream Valley Park could potentially be subject to *de minimis* impacts as well. Internal meetings between M-NCPPC will occur in December where they will further discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. Additional coordination would be required regarding anticipated impacts to Long Branch Local Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.



**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Evaluate possibly landscaping the existing “rock garden” between Elm Street Urban Park and the Air Rights Building		
2.	Evaluate potentially raising Rock Creek Trail in an effort to decrease flooding impacts and siltation. Look into potentially constructing a boardwalk.		
3.	Refine the LOD within Long Branch Stream Valley Park to determine if tree clearing can be minimized or if the LOD can be decreased		
4.	Long Branch Local Park- investigate potential left turns on Piney Branch Road		
5.	Potentially move Long Branch Community Center		
6.	Potentially construct a new access road into Long Branch Community Center		
7.	New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park- look into what they are planning to do with the parcels at corner of University Blvd and Piney Branch Road		
8.	Are there plans to close off access to the corner parcels from Piney Branch/University? If so, sector plan has potential loop road constructed through the park		
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Jim Guinther	Purple Line	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Harriet Levine	Purple Line	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Chuck Kines	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-495-2184	Charles.Kines@montgomeryparks.org
Doug Redmond	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-384-2417	Doug.Redmond@montgomeryparks.org
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com



**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation**  
**Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**Parkside Headquarters**  
**9500 Brunett Avenue**  
**Silver Spring, Maryland**  
**Wednesday, January 25, 2012 at 1:30 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda

**1. Introduction**

The meeting was kicked off with introductions. Ms. Harriet Levine provided a brief background of the proposed project. Since the meeting attendees were familiar with the proposed Purple Line alignment, there was no need to discuss it further. Section 4(f) and its purpose was defined for the group.

A park-by-park discussion was held, where each park that would be affected by the proposed project was described with regard to existing conditions and access. In addition, anticipated impacts to each park were discussed, as well as potential impact findings.

A map of the proposed alignment, including the locations of each park along or in close proximity to the proposed alignment, was presented to the group. It was determined that there would be no impact to the East-West Highway Neighborhood Conservation Area, as the proposed Purple Line would be constructed on the opposite side of the street from this area.

**2. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings, M-NCPPC is in the process of redesigning Elm Street Urban Park. The park will be completely redesigned in the future, though no timeline was provided. M-NCPPC is overseeing the design of the park. All of the renderings of the proposed reconstructed park have been provided to the Purple Line Team. The team has been working with M-NCPPC and Montgomery County in an effort to construct access to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail in an effort to minimize any potential impacts to the park. Construction access would be through the Interim CCT. Construction impacts to the park would be minimized to the maximum extent possible.



**General Engineering Consultant Team**  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Requardt and Associates JV  
801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail. The trail connection would be aerial over the transitway, where it would cross to parallel the transitway to the north. The pedestrian bridge over the transitway would be fenced within a boxed truss over the track.

There were questions about the potential visual impacts of the proposed trail and transitway from Elm Street Urban Park. In the vicinity of the park, the proposed transitway would be constructed within the tunnel under the Air Rights Building. There would be walls constructed directly north of the park that would screen the view of the transitway from the park. The design of the walls would be consistent with what is proposed with the redevelopment of the Air Rights Building. The walls would end with a louver (a framed opening with movable horizontal slats for ventilation), directly west of the proposed trail connection from Elm Street Urban Park to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed through the tunnel in lieu of a trail so that patrons could access the Purple Line or Metro's Red Line. In addition, the sidewalk would serve as an alternate means of crossing Wisconsin Avenue.

A rock garden currently exists between Elm Street Urban Park and the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail. There were discussions about potentially including landscaping between the Air Rights Building and the park. The rock garden could potentially be landscaped up to the louver area. This will be further explored and will be discussed at future agency coordination meetings.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. However, if the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited.

### **3. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the proposed project would be aligned completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur during construction for the construction of the trail and transitway, as well as construction equipment. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

The design of the proposed connector trail from the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to existing Rock Creek Trail was discussed. The proposed trail connection would occur completely within Montgomery County right-of-way in an effort to minimize direct impacts to the park and natural resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. The engineering and construction of the trail was discussed and the team described why the proposed connection would work. Through the majority of the park, the proposed Capital Crescent Trail would be aligned to the south side of the proposed transitway. The trail would be constructed at a lower elevation than the transitway in an effort to preserve the viewshed within Rock Creek Stream Valley Park to the maximum extent possible. On the eastern side of the park, the trail would cross under the proposed transitway in a tunnel, where it would parallel the transitway to the north.

We revisited the previous discussion regarding potentially moving the Rock Creek Trail in an effort to reduce flooding and siltation issues that currently plague the trail. Moving the trail is not a feasible option because of the instability of slope to the south of the proposed transitway, the construction of the proposed trail and transitway and associated abutments, and the location of the Rock Creek floodplain. They requested that the Purple Line Team evaluate potentially raising the trail, either by constructing a boardwalk or by some other means through the proposed project area. Elevating the trail would improve the functionality of the trail.

M-NCPPC questioned stormwater management measures within the park. Stormwater management facilities would not be constructed within the park, as this would result in an increase in impacts to park resources. As such, M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to the park and trail.

#### **4. Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park**

Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park would be evaluated as two separate parks. However, since the alignment and related issues would include the same discussion for both parks, both are included below. At the May 16, 2012 formal agency coordination meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to both Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park. However, additional discussions with other M-NCPPC and Montgomery County staff after that meeting, it was determined that additional minimization measures would need to be evaluated before M-NCPPC would concur with *de minimis* impact determinations for either park. As part of mitigation, M-NCPPC indicated that replanting would be required within the parks to replace vegetation that would be removed as a result of the proposed project. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.11 acre of property and approximately 0.36 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Stream Valley Park. In addition, the Preferred Alignment would require the acquisition of approximately 0.07 acre of property and approximately 0.24 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However; some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley





Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks.

Five-foot wide sidewalks currently exist on either side of Piney Branch Road. The proposed project would include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks to replace those that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. Montgomery County would like to construct 10-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road. M-NCPPC stated that the Sector Plan that is currently under development includes sidewalk widening to 10 feet along Piney Branch Road. The Purple Line Team indicated that while the current plans include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road, some measures could be taken to prepare the proposed project area for widened sidewalks in the future. Potential measures include raising the headwalls and wingwalls associated with the proposed culvert extension by 2 ½ feet so that sidewalk widening could be accommodated without impacting the extended culvert in the future.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be restricted. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the restricted access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. In addition, there is not enough room on Piney Branch Road to construct left turn lanes without substantially impacting buildings, which would be necessary to allow for left turns on Piney Branch Road. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road. Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC stated that no left turns on Piney Branch Road would be unacceptable according to the Long Branch Sector Plan, which is currently under development. Approximately 300 to 400 people use the community center every day, so there is a need to access it. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated their opinion was that since the restricted access to and from the community center would be a direct result of the proposed Purple Line, MTA is responsible remediating any potential impacts to access. M-NCPPC indicated that they didn't feel that all measures were thoroughly exhausted to minimize impacts to access to the Long Branch Community Center. They requested additional minimization and mitigation measures be evaluated. Suggested measures include the following:

- Further widen Piney Branch Road so that left turn lanes could be included in each direction;
- Potentially realign the entrance to the Community Center with Barron Street;
- Potentially relocate the Long Branch Community Center from its current location to the west, east of the intersection of Garland Avenue and Walden Road;
- Potentially construct an additional access road from Garland Avenue near the Long Branch Library along an existing pedestrian path. A recently reconstructed pedestrian bridge over Long Branch would need to be reconstructed to accommodate vehicular traffic; and

The construction of an additional Long Branch Community Center access road from University Boulevard to Langley Drive has been evaluated in the past by M-NCPPC and Montgomery County. However, that option was dismissed, as the access road would be through an existing residential area and would result in a significant increase in traffic within the neighborhood and affecting safety.



M-NCPPC requested that the Purple Line Team attempt to minimize tree loss within Long Branch Stream Valley Park, as the proposed limits of disturbance, as currently designed, appear to be a bit more generous than is necessary. The Team will further refine the temporary impacts, limits-of-disturbance, and tree removal within Long Branch Stream Valley Park.

The measures listed above will be further evaluated and discussed at the next meeting with M-NCPPC.

#### **5. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**

For documentation purposes, this park includes Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail. The Purple Line Team verified that this would be acceptable to M-NCPPC. The park is 543 acres in size, consists of seven different units, and encompasses the Sligo Creek floodplain. The park was purchased and developed using Capper-Cramton Act funding.

The proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue in the vicinity of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. In addition, the proposed Green Trail would be constructed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.25 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 1.48 acre of temporary impacts. In addition, a 0.03 acre sliver of land currently owned by Montgomery County that abuts Wayne Avenue to the south would be conveyed to M-NCPPC for use as park. Not only with the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Realigning the existing stream would be beneficial to the park and the surrounding area, as it would alleviate these flooding issues. Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project.

Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. Mapping was presented at the meeting to illustrate proposed tree removal. Tree removal was determined as a combined result of aerial photography, engineering, and site reconnaissance to determine where trees currently exist that would need to be removed. It was determined during the meeting that WSSC is completing a lot of work within Sligo Creek. M-NCPPC will attempt to provide mapping of the stream upgrades.

The proposed access road located to the south of Wayne Avenue is currently a utility easement. This area was also used as an access road for WSSC to complete work in January 2012. Tree removal to the south of Wayne Avenue could potentially be further minimized. To the north of Wayne Avenue, parking within the park would be reconfigured and replaced as a result of the proposed project. There were concerns about potential impacts to Sligo Creek Parkway as a result of the roadway tie-ins. This had already been considered by the team, and the proposed tie-ins are relatively short.

M-NCPPC will have an internal meeting to discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. There will be further discussions between M-NCPPC and the Purple Line Team to discuss a potential *de minimis* impact finding.

#### **6. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard



intersection. The transitway and station construction would require roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.32 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 0.35 acre of temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.

The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store and gas station, located directly north of the park. In addition, the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Sector Plan is currently being developed for the proposed project area. M-NCPPC has expressed an interest in the identified displacement area directly to the north of the park for potential future parking. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park. M-NCPPC indicated that the sector plan that is currently under development indicates that a loop road would be constructed through the park to provide access to private property to the north of the park. M-NCPPC stated that the park would be redeveloped, regardless of the proposed project. The park will be reclassified from a neighborhood park to community use/urban recreation park. Due to so many unknowns with regard to potential impacts and mitigation, a finding for this park is pending.

## **7. Next Meeting**

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park and Rock Creek Stream Valley Park would be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process. Depending on refinements to the LOD, Long Branch Stream Valley Park could potentially be subject to *de minimis* impacts as well. Internal meetings between M-NCPPC will occur in December where they will further discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. Additional coordination would be required regarding anticipated impacts to Long Branch Local Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.



**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Evaluate possibly landscaping the existing “rock garden” between Elm Street Urban Park and the Air Rights Building		
2.	Evaluate potentially raising Rock Creek Trail in an effort to decrease flooding impacts and siltation. Look into potentially constructing a boardwalk.		
3.	Refine the LOD within Long Branch Stream Valley Park to determine if tree clearing can be minimized or if the LOD can be decreased		
4.	Long Branch Local Park- investigate potential left turns on Piney Branch Road		
5.	Potentially move Long Branch Community Center		
6.	Potentially construct a new access road into Long Branch Community Center		
7.	New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park- look into what they are planning to do with the parcels at corner of University Blvd and Piney Branch Road		
8.	Are there plans to close off access to the corner parcels from Piney Branch/University? If so, sector plan has potential loop road constructed through the park		
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Jim Guinther	Purple Line	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Harriet Levine	Purple Line	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Chuck Kines	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-495-2184	Charles.Kines@montgomeryparks.org
Doug Redmond	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-384-2417	Doug.Redmond@montgomeryparks.org
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com



Purple Line GEC  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation  
Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting  
Parkside Headquarters  
9500 Brunett Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland  
Friday, February 1, at 3:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

**ATTENDEES:**

- Mr. Tom Autry, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Planning
- Mr. Stephen Chandlee, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC
- Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC
- Ms. Jayne Hench, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. John Hench, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC
- Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line GEC
- Mr. Michael Madden, Maryland Transit Administration
- Ms. Mitra Pedoeem, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Ms. Melissa Williams, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Planning

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Powerpoint Presentation

The meeting opened with introductions. A brief overview of the agenda, which included a discussion of de minimis, de minimis and temporary occupancy determinations to date, and a discussion of outstanding park impact determinations, was provided to the group.

**1. Discussion of Section 4(f) *de minimis* impact findings and the *de minimis* process**

The Team described for the group what a Section 4(f) *de minimis* impact finding is, as well as the process for determining *de minimis* impacts. A finding of *de minimis* impact can be made only if the official with jurisdiction over that resource concurs that the project “will not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes” that make the property eligible for protection under Section 4(f). The finding is based on the transportation use of the Section 4(f) resource, together with any impact, avoidance, minimization, or enhancement measures incorporated into the project. A use of a resource was described as the permanent impact to a Section 4(f) resource by a transportation project. Examples were provided as to what, exactly, would constitute a use. The public needs to be afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the effects of the proposed project on protected activities, features, and attributes of the Section 4(f) resource. A *de minimis* impact finding does not affect the significance of the resource, minimization or mitigation plans. It was also discussed that a *de minimis* impact finding is “as mitigated.” This means that the anticipated impacts, along with any mitigation measures that are agreed upon by



both parties would be included in the *de minimis* letter. The terms of reaching a *de minimis* impact finding would be outlined in the letter.

A brief overview of *de minimis* and temporary occupancy determinations to date was provided for the meeting attendees.

## **2. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings and a follow up email from M-NCPPC pm January 3, 2012, as currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail. The trail connection would be aerial over the transitway, where it would cross to parallel the transitway to the north. The pedestrian bridge over the transitway would be fenced within a boxed truss over the track.

There were questions about the potential visual impacts of the proposed trail and transitway from Elm Street Urban Park. In the vicinity of the park, the proposed transitway would be constructed within the tunnel under the Air Rights Building. There would be walls constructed directly north of the park that would screen the view of the transitway from the park. The design of the walls would be consistent with what is proposed with the redevelopment of the Air Rights Building.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, impacts to Elm Street Urban Park as a result of the proposed project would require a temporary occupancy determination. However, if the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited. The meeting attendees agreed that the proposed project would result in temporary occupancy at Elm Street Urban Park.

## **3. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the limit of disturbance for the proposed project would be completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur in order to perform the construction of the trail and transitway. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

At previous meetings, attendees requested that the team evaluate potentially moving the Rock Creek Trail in an effort to reduce flooding and siltation issues that currently plague the trail. As discussed earlier, moving the trail is not a feasible option because of the instability of slope to the south of the proposed transitway, the construction of the proposed trail and transitway and associated abutments, and the location of the Rock Creek floodplain. The team evaluated raising the trail within Montgomery County right-of-way. It was determined that the trail could be raised on an elevated wooden boardwalk through the right-of-way, which would elevate the trail out of the one year floodplain, which is the reason for all of the sedimentation issues the trail the trail is subject to directly adjacent to the creek. Raising the trail on an elevated boardwalk would be necessary so that the flow of water would not be impeded. The trail would be designed to M-NCPPC standards. Coordination with M-NCPPC will be ongoing regarding the design of the trail. M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to



the park and trail. The meeting attendees agreed that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Rock Creek Stream Valley Park and Rock Creek National Recreational Trail.

#### **4. Long Branch Stream Valley Park**

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.11 acre of property and approximately 0.36 acre of temporary construction easements from the park. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading.

At previous formal agency coordination meetings and a follow-up email sent from M-NCPPC on January 3, 2013, M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Long Branch Stream Valley Park. The meeting attendees agreed that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Long Branch Stream Valley Park.

#### **5. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**

For documentation purposes, this park includes Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail. The Purple Line Team verified that this would be acceptable to M-NCPPC. The park is 543 acres in size, consists of seven different units, and encompasses the Sligo Creek floodplain. The park was purchased and developed using Capper-Cramton Act funding.

As currently designed, the proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue through Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. At the request of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation, the proposed construction of the Green Trail would be completed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.25 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 1.48 acre of temporary impacts. Of this total, 0.09 acre of permanent impacts would be a result of completing the construction of the Green Trail. In addition, a 0.03 acre sliver of land currently owned by Montgomery County that abuts Wayne Avenue to the south would be conveyed to M-NCPPC for use as park. Not only will the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Realigning the existing stream would be beneficial to the park and the surrounding area, as it would alleviate these flooding issues. Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project.

The proposed project could require the reconstruction of an existing storm drain to handle additional runoff. The storm drain is located to the north of Wayne Avenue within Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park and is aligned under an

existing track that is use by Silver Spring International Middle School. If culvert under track is replaced, it would be done during the summer time when track is not used as heavily. The track would be restored to pre-existing or better conditions upon completion of the storm drain replacement.

Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. Mapping was presented at the meeting to illustrate proposed tree removal. Tree removal was determined as a combined result of aerial photography, engineering, and site reconnaissance to determine where trees currently exist that would need to be removed. A total of 29 trees would need to be removed, including 13 to the north of Wayne Avenue, 13 south of Wayne Avenue and west of Sligo Creek, and three to the south of Wayne Avenue and east of the creek. Any significant and/or champion trees identified within the proposed project area would be preserved. Trees to be preserved would be marked with protective fencing to avoid impacts or removal during construction

The proposed access road located to the south of Wayne Avenue is currently a utility easement. This area was also used as an access road for WSSC to complete work in January 2012. Utilizing this utility easement as an access road during construction would minimize the amount of tree removal required to complete bridge construction. Tree removal to the south of Wayne Avenue could potentially be further minimized. To the north of Wayne Avenue, parking within the park would be reconfigured and replaced as a result of the proposed project. There were concerns about potential impacts to Sligo Creek Parkway as a result of the roadway tie-ins. This had already been considered by the team, and the proposed tie-ins are relatively short.

Several mitigation measures were proposed at the meeting, including the following:

- Tree planting where appropriate within park to mitigate for tree removal
- Convey 0.03 acre of land to the south of Wayne Avenue currently used for transportation to M-NCPPC for use as park
- Replacement of guardrails, signs, and other existing structures on Wayne Avenue and Sligo Creek Parkway with new structures, where appropriate. New structures would match existing elements throughout the park.
- Replanting and restoration would occur within cleared areas to the maximum extent practicable.

Upon completion of the discussion of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, the meeting attendees agreed that, as mitigated, the proposed project would result in a *de minimis* impact finding.

## **6. Long Branch Local Park**

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Local Park to the south. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be reconstructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road to replace sidewalks impacted by the proposed project.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.02 acre of property and approximately 0.27 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to

minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However; some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks. As part of mitigation, M-NCPPC indicated that they would like the proposed project to include invasive species removal, along with replanting within the parks to replace vegetation that would be removed as a result of the proposed project. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

Five-foot wide sidewalks currently exist on either side of Piney Branch Road. The proposed project would include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks to replace those that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. The Long Branch Sector Plan includes sidewalk widening to 15 feet along either side of Piney Branch Road. While the current plans include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road, some measures could be taken to prepare the proposed project area for widened sidewalks in the future, including raising the headwalls and wingwalls associated with the proposed culvert extension by 2 ½ feet so that sidewalk widening could be accommodated without impacting the extended culvert in the future.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be modified. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the modified access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. In addition, there is not enough room on Piney Branch Road to construct left turn lanes without substantially impacting buildings, which would be necessary to allow for left turns on Piney Branch Road. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road. Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC stated that no left turns on Piney Branch Road would be unacceptable according to the Long Branch Sector Plan, which is currently under development. Approximately 300 to 400 people use the community center every day, so there is a need to access it. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated their opinion was that since the restricted access to and from the community center would be a direct result of the proposed Purple Line, MTA is responsible for remediating any potential impacts to access. M-NCPPC indicated that they didn't feel that all measures were thoroughly exhausted to minimize impacts to access to the Long Branch Community Center. They requested additional minimization and mitigation measures be evaluated. Suggested measures include the following:

- Further widen Piney Branch Road so that left turn lanes could be included in each direction;
- Realign the entrance to the Community Center with Barron Street;
- Assist with performing a benefit-cost analysis to relocate the Long Branch Community Center from its current location to the west, east of the intersection of Garland Avenue and Walden Road; and

- Construct an additional access road from Garland Avenue near the Long Branch Library along an existing pedestrian path. A recently reconstructed pedestrian bridge over Long Branch would need to be reconstructed to accommodate vehicular traffic.

The construction of an additional Long Branch Community Center access road from University Boulevard to Langley Drive has been evaluated in the past by M-NCPPC and Montgomery County. However, that option was dismissed, as the access road would be through an existing residential area and would result in a significant increase in traffic within the neighborhood and affecting safety.

Including left turns in each direction would require an extensive amount of additional right-of-way and would result in residential and business displacements along Piney Branch Road. Several different alternatives will be evaluated in an attempt to maintain full access to the Long Branch Community Center.

## **7. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard intersection. The transitway and station construction would require roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements. The proposed project would also include the upgrade of an existing stormwater culvert on the southeast side of the park.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.32 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 0.35 acre of temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the project would require the removal of existing park amenities, including sitting areas and aesthetic features (landscaped structures, artwork, and decorative bricks). The construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.

Potential impacts to New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park have been minimized to the maximum extent possible. The project would implement closed drainage systems. In addition, the space between the expanded roadway curb and reconstructed sidewalk would be eliminated.

The Long Branch Mobility Plan indicates that Montgomery County intends to extend Gilbert Street to the east, across University Boulevard, to Piney Branch Road. The extension of Gilbert Street would be through the park. M-NCPPC stated that the park would be redeveloped, regardless of the proposed project. The park will be reclassified from a neighborhood park to community use/urban recreation park.

The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store and gas station, located directly north of the park. M-NCPPC has expressed an interest in the identified displacement area for potential future parking and park expansion. During construction, this area would be used as a staging area for construction in the Long Branch area. There is more interest in a parcel of land to the south of the park that currently houses the "Central American Solidarity Association of Maryland" (CASA). The parcel is owned by Montgomery County. The purchase of the parcel would enable the expansion of the park to the south. Since Montgomery County plans to construct Gilbert Street through the park, the expansion of the park to the south as opposed to the north would minimize park segmentation. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park.



## 8. Next Meeting

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park would require temporary occupancy. In addition, M-NCPPC concurred that Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, as mitigated, would be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process. A meeting with M-NCPPC Directorate will occur in February 2013 to finalize concurrence on the parks that would result in *de minimis* impact findings, as well as to continue discussions regarding Long Branch Local Park and anticipated access impacts. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.





---

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

---

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Prepare for Purple Line Coordination meeting with M-NCPPC Directorate, to be held in late February 2013		
2.	Further evaluate alternatives that would further minimize access impacts to Long Branch Community Center.		
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Harriet Levine	Purple Line	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
John E. Hench	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-650-4364	John.hench@montgomeryparks.org
Stephen Chandlee	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-765-8604	Stephen.chandlee@montgomeryparks.org
Chuck Kines	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2184	Charles.Kines@montgomeryparks.org
Mitro Pedoeem,	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2554	Mitra.pedoeem@montgomeryparks.org
Jim Guinther	Purple Line	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Mike Madden	Maryland Transit Administration	443-451-3718	mmadden@mta.maryland.gov
Melissa Williams	M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Planning	301-495-4642	Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org
Doug Redmond	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-384-2417	Doug.Redmond@montgomeryparks.org
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Jayne Hench	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2504	Jayne.hench@montgomeryparks.org
Tom Autry	M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Planning	301-495-4533	Thomas.autry@montgomeryplanning.org



**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation**  
**Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**Parkside Headquarters**  
**9500 Brunett Avenue**  
**Silver Spring, Maryland**  
**Tuesday, February 26, at 3:00 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:**

- Mr. David Anspacher, M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Department of Planning
- Mr. Tom Autry, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Planning
- Ms. Mary Bradford, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Stephen Chandlee, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Tony Devaul, M-NCPPC, Park Police
- Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC
- Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC
- Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC
- Mr. Jamie Kendrick, Maryland Transit Administration
- Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Ms. Linda Komes, M-NCPPC PDD
- Mr. Michael Madden, Maryland Transit Administration
- Mr. John Nissel, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC Department of Parks
- Mr. Mike Riley, M-NCPPC, Department of Parks
- Mr. Bill Tyler, M-NCPPC Southern Region Parks
- Mr. Michael Weil, National Capital Planning Commission
- Ms. Melissa Williams, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Planning

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Powerpoint Presentation
- Park fact sheets
- Agenda
- Small portion of Montgomery County Planning Board Meeting Minutes from February 2013

The meeting opened with introductions. A brief overview of the agenda, which included an overview of the Purple line, review of interagency coordination to date, discussion of de minimis, de minimis and temporary occupancy determinations to date, and a discussion of outstanding park impact determinations, was presented to the group.

**1. Overview of the Proposed Purple Line**

Mr. Michael Madden from the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) provided an overview of the proposed project, including the alignment, current status, and the project schedule moving forward. He discussed the alignment from west to east, including an overview of the stations. The project entered the Preliminary



**General Engineering Consultant Team**  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Requardt and Associates JV  
100 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21201



Engineering (PE) Phase and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in October 2011. The FEIS and technical reports are currently under development and are scheduled to be completed in Spring 2013. The PE plans are on schedule to be completed this summer. While the PE plans and FEIS are moving toward completion, coordination with regulatory and resource agencies will be ongoing for the duration of the project.

An overview of the schedule was also provided. Neighborhood work group meetings are ongoing throughout the life of the proposed project. Open houses and the publication and review of the FEIS will occur in Spring 2013. A Record of Decision will be issued in Summer 2013, as will the completion of PE Plans and the start of right-of-way acquisition. Final design will begin in Fall 2013. Construction will begin in 2015 and the Purple Line will be open for service in 2020.

## **2. Purple Line Agency Coordination to Date**

Ms. Kristi Hewlett and Mr. Chuck Kines provided an overview of agency coordination to date. The Purple Line Team met with Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), Montgomery County Department of Parks on several occasions throughout the last year. Prior to this meeting, the Purple Line Team met with M-NCPPC at the Parkside Headquarters on January 25, 2012, May 16, 2012, November 21, 2012, and February 1, 2013. Informal communications between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC have been ongoing throughout the FEIS process. Coordination with other Montgomery County agencies, such as M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Planning and Montgomery County Department of Transportation, has been ongoing as well. Montgomery County also provided a review of conceptual plans for the proposed project.

## **3. Discussion of Section 4(f) *de minimis* impact findings and the *de minimis* process**

Ms. Kristi Hewlett described for the group Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, Section 4(f) *de minimis* impact finding is, and the process for determining *de minimis* impacts.

Section 4(f) refers to the original section within the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966, which protects publicly owned public parks and recreational lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. Section 4(f) applies to projects that receive funding from or require approval by an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation. Section 4(f) is implemented by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration through the regulation 23 CFR 774.

Before approving a project that uses Section 4(f) property, must either (1) determine that the impacts are *de minimis*, or (2) undertake a Section 4(f) Evaluation. If the Section 4(f) Evaluation identifies a feasible and prudent alternative that completely avoids Section 4(f) properties, it must be selected. If there is no feasible and prudent alternative that avoids all Section 4(f) properties, FHWA has some discretion in selecting the alternative that causes the least overall harm (see discussion below). FHWA must also find that all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property has occurred.

A finding of *de minimis* impact can be made only if the official with jurisdiction over that resource concurs that the project “will not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes” that make the property eligible for protection under Section 4(f). The finding is based on the transportation use of the Section 4(f) resource, together with any impact, avoidance, minimization, or enhancement measures incorporated into the project. A use of a resource was described as the permanent impact to a Section 4(f) resource by a transportation project. Examples were provided as to what, exactly, would constitute a use. The public needs to be afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the effects of the proposed project on protected activities, features, and attributes of the Section 4(f) resource. A *de minimis* impact finding does not affect the significance of the resource, minimization or mitigation plans. It was also discussed that a *de minimis* impact finding is “as mitigated.” This means that the

anticipated impacts, along with any mitigation measures that are agreed upon by both parties would be included in the *de minimis* letter. The terms of reaching a *de minimis* impact finding would be outlined in the letter.

The *de minimis* process was outlined for the meeting attendees. The lead Federal agency responsible for the project (FTA) would send a letter to the agency with jurisdiction over the park (M-NCPPC) for their concurrence that the proposed project would have a *de minimis* impact on the identified resource. Upon receipt of concurrence from M-NCPPC, the public involvement process for *de minimis* impacts would commence. The proposed project, as well as anticipated impacts to the park, would be advertised. Project would be advertised for public comment. FTA would prefer to advertise in local newspapers, but advertisement could include posting signs within the park. Typically includes signage that provides an overview of *de minimis* and anticipated impacts to the park. The public involvement period for *de minimis* impacts would be for 30 days. Any questions and comments received during the public comment period regarding the anticipated impacts to the park would be addressed after the comment period ends. A *de minimis* impact finding would be issued for each park when the Final Environmental Impact Statement is complete.

A brief overview of *de minimis* and temporary occupancy determinations to date was provided for the meeting attendees.

#### **4. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings and a follow up email from M-NCPPC pm January 3, 2012, as currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail. The trail connection would be aerial over the transitway, where it would cross to parallel the transitway to the north. The pedestrian bridge over the transitway would be fenced within a boxed truss over the track.

There were questions about the potential visual impacts of the proposed trail and transitway from Elm Street Urban Park. In the vicinity of the park, the proposed transitway would be constructed within the tunnel under the Air Rights Building. There would be walls constructed directly north of the park that would screen the view of the transitway from the park. The design of the walls would be consistent with what is proposed with the redevelopment of the Air Rights Building.

There is currently a rock garden that exists between the Air Rights Building and the park. The rock garden is considered an amenity that was installed by the owners of the Air Rights Building as mitigation for the height of the building.

In previous meetings, M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, impacts to Elm Street Urban Park as a result of the proposed project would require a temporary occupancy determination. However, they stated that it was their opinion that there would be *de minimis* impacts to the park. There are concerns about the proposed building that would be constructed at the end of the tunnel to house the tunnel emergency ventilation fans and associated power supply. Meeting attendees expressed concerns about when the fans would be tested and any potential impacts that it would have on the park. The testing would be conducted during off-peak times approximately once a month. There were also concerns raised about visual impacts that would result from the construction of the tunnel, as well as the transitway where it would exit the tunnel. It was reiterated for the meeting attendees that the proposed transitway would be at a lower elevation than the park and would not be visible from the park. In addition, the proposed tunnel would be constructed consistent with the Air Rights Building.

If the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited.

## **5. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the limit of disturbance for the proposed project would be completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur in order to perform the construction of the trail and transitway. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

At previous meetings, attendees requested that the team evaluate potentially moving the Rock Creek Trail in an effort to reduce flooding and siltation issues that currently plague the trail. As discussed earlier, moving the trail is not a feasible option because of the instability of slope to the south of the proposed transitway, the construction of the proposed trail and transitway and associated abutments, and the location of the Rock Creek floodplain. The team evaluated raising the trail within Montgomery County right-of-way. It was determined that the trail could be raised on an elevated wooden boardwalk through the right-of-way, which would elevate the trail out of the one year floodplain, which is the reason for all of the sedimentation issues the trail the trail is subject to directly adjacent to the creek. Raising the trail on an elevated boardwalk would be necessary so that the flow of water would not be impeded. The trail would be designed to M-NCPPC standards. Coordination with M-NCPPC will be ongoing regarding the design of the trail. M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to the park and trail. The meeting attendees agreed that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Rock Creek Stream Valley Park and Rock Creek National Recreational Trail.

## **6. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**

As currently designed, the proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue through Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. At the request of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation, the proposed construction of the Green Trail would be completed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.25 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 1.48 acre of temporary impacts. Of this total, 0.09 acre of permanent impacts would be a result of completing the construction of the Green Trail. In addition, a 0.03 acre sliver of land currently owned by Montgomery County that abuts Wayne Avenue to the south would be conveyed to M-NCPPC for use as park. Not only will the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project.

The proposed project would require the reconstruction of an existing storm drain to handle additional runoff. The storm drain is located to the north of Wayne Avenue within Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park and is aligned under an existing track that is use by Silver Spring International Middle School. If culvert under track is replaced, it would be done during the summer time when track is not used as heavily. The track would be restored to pre-existing or better conditions upon completion of the storm drain replacement.

Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. Mapping was presented at the meeting to illustrate proposed tree removal. Tree removal was determined as a combined result of aerial photography, engineering, and site reconnaissance to determine where trees currently exist that would need to be removed. A total of 29 trees would need to be removed, including 13 to the north of Wayne Avenue, 13 south of Wayne Avenue and west of Sligo Creek, and three to the south of Wayne Avenue and east of the creek. Any significant and/or champion trees identified within the proposed project area would be preserved. Trees to be preserved would be marked with protective fencing to avoid impacts or removal during construction.

The proposed access road located to the south of Wayne Avenue is currently a utility easement. This area was also used as an access road for WSSC to complete work in January 2012. Utilizing this utility easement as an access road during construction would minimize the amount of tree removal required to complete bridge construction. Tree removal to the south of Wayne Avenue could potentially be further minimized. To the north of Wayne Avenue, parking within the park would be reconfigured and replaced as a result of the proposed project. There were concerns about potential impacts to Sligo Creek Parkway as a result of the roadway tie-ins. This had already been considered by the team, and the proposed tie-ins are relatively short.

Several mitigation measures were proposed at the meeting, including the following:

- Tree planting where appropriate within park to mitigate for tree removal
- Convey 0.03 acre of land to the south of Wayne Avenue currently used for transportation to M-NCPPC for use as park
- Replacement of guardrails, signs, and other existing structures on Wayne Avenue and Sligo Creek Parkway with new structures, where appropriate. New structures would match existing elements throughout the park.
- Replanting and restoration would occur within cleared areas to the maximum extent practicable.

Upon completion of the discussion of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, the meeting attendees agreed that, as mitigated, the proposed project would result in a *de minimis* impact finding.

## **7. Long Branch Stream Valley Park**

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.11 acre of property and approximately 0.36 acre of temporary construction easements from the park. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading.



At previous formal agency coordination meetings and a follow-up email sent from M-NCPPC on January 3, 2013, M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Long Branch Stream Valley Park. The meeting attendees agreed that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Long Branch Stream Valley Park.

## **8. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard intersection. The transitway and station construction would require roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements. The proposed project would also include the upgrade of an existing stormwater culvert on the southeast side of the park.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.32 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 0.35 acre of temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the project would require the removal of existing park amenities, including sitting areas and aesthetic features (landscaped structures, artwork, and decorative bricks). The construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.

Potential impacts to New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park have been minimized to the maximum extent possible. The project would implement closed drainage systems. In addition, the space between the expanded roadway curb and reconstructed sidewalk would be eliminated.

The Long Branch Mobility Plan indicates that Montgomery County intends to extend Gilbert Street to the east, across University Boulevard, to Piney Branch Road. The extension of Gilbert Street would be through the park. The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store and gas station, located directly north of the park. M-NCPPC has expressed an interest in the identified displacement area for potential future parking and park expansion. During construction, this area would be used as a staging area for construction in the Long Branch area. There have also been discussions regarding potentially expanding the park to the south onto property owned by Montgomery County (CASA). The property under consideration is currently occupied. Expanding to the south would enable the park to expand and experience less segmentation than if it were expanded to the north. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park. M-NCPPC stated that the park would be redeveloped, regardless of the proposed project. The park will be reclassified from a neighborhood park to community use/urban recreation park. M-NCPPC indicated that they would like financial assistance from the MTA in redeveloping the park.

At the meeting, M-NCPPC concurred that, as mitigated, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park.

## **9. Long Branch Local Park**

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Local Park to the south. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each

direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be reconstructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road to replace sidewalks impacted by the proposed project.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.02 acre of property and approximately 0.28 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new parallel pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However; some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks. As part of mitigation, M-NCPPC indicated that they would like the proposed project to include invasive species removal, along with replanting within the parks to replace vegetation that would be removed as a result of the proposed project. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

Five-foot wide sidewalks currently exist on either side of Piney Branch Road. The proposed project would include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks to replace those that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. The Long Branch Sector Plan includes sidewalk widening to 15 feet along either side of Piney Branch Road. While the current plans include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road, some measures could be taken to prepare the proposed project area for widened sidewalks in the future, including raising the headwalls and wingwalls associated with the proposed culvert extension by 2 ½ feet so that sidewalk widening could be accommodated without impacting the extended culvert in the future.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be modified. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the modified access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. In addition, there is not enough room on Piney Branch Road to construct left turn lanes without substantially impacting buildings, which would be necessary to allow for left turns on Piney Branch Road. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road. Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC stated that no left turns on Piney Branch Road would be unacceptable according to the Long Branch Sector Plan, which is currently under development. Approximately 300 to 400 people use the community center every day, so there is a need to access it. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated their opinion was that since the restricted access to and from the community center would be a direct result of the proposed Purple Line, MTA is responsible for remediating any potential impacts to access. M-NCPPC indicated that they didn't feel that all measures were thoroughly exhausted to minimize impacts to access to the Long Branch Community Center. They

requested additional minimization and mitigation measures be evaluated. Suggested measures include the following:

- Further widen Piney Branch Road so that left turn lanes could be included in each direction;
- Realign the entrance to the Community Center with Barron Street;
- Assist with performing a benefit-cost analysis to relocate the Long Branch Community Center from its current location to the west, east of the intersection of Garland Avenue and Walden Road; and
- Construct an additional access road from Garland Avenue near the Long Branch Library along an existing pedestrian path. A recently reconstructed pedestrian bridge over Long Branch would need to be reconstructed to accommodate vehicular traffic.

The construction of an additional Long Branch Community Center access road from University Boulevard to Langley Drive has been evaluated in the past by M-NCPPC and Montgomery County. However, that option was dismissed, as the access road would be through an existing residential area and would result in a significant increase in traffic within the neighborhood and affecting safety. Including left turns in each direction would require an extensive amount of additional right-of-way and would result in residential and business displacements along Piney Branch Road.

Given the small amount of permanent impacts to the park, the fact that the proposed project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that qualify the park for protection under the provisions of Section 4(f), and the proposed mitigation and minimization measures that have been discussed between the M-NCPPC and MTA to minimize impacts to the park, the MTA feels that the impacts to Long Branch Local Park would meet the criteria for a *de minimis* impact determination. However, the M-NCPPC indicated that eliminating left turns into and out of the center would result in significant impacts to the operations of the community center. There were also concerns expressed as to the increase in traffic on Piney Branch Road that would result from the need to complete u-turns. They felt that in addition to the inconvenience that eliminating left turns would cause, the modification to the traffic patterns on Piney Branch Road could result in potential safety issues. They stated that if MTA was not willing to assist with funding the relocation of the community center, the proposed project would result in a Section 4(f) use at Long Branch Local Park that could not be minimized or mitigated to the *de minimis* level. As such, since the M-NCPPC is not willing to concur with a *de minimis* impact determination at Long Branch Local Park, a full Section 4(f) evaluation will be completed.

## 10. Next Meeting

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park would require temporary occupancy. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur that Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, as mitigated, would be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process. Future meetings between the M-NCPPC and Purple Line Team will focus on continued coordination for park-specific mitigation and minimization measures.



---

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

---

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Prepare coordination for <i>de minimis</i> impact determinations		
2.	Further evaluate alternatives that would further minimize access impacts to Long Branch Community Center.		
3.	Continue coordination regarding park-specific mitigation and minimization measures.		
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
David Anspacher	M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Planning	301-495-2191	David.anspacher@montgomeryplanning.org
Tom Autry	M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Planning	301-495-4533	Thomas.autry@montgomeryplanning.org
Mary Bradford	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2500	Mary.bradford@montgomeryparks.org
Stephen Chandlee	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-765-8604	Stephen.chandlee@montgomeryparks.org
Tony DeVaul	M-NCPPC Park Police	301-929-2731	Antonio.devaul@montgomeryparks.org
Jim Guinther	Purple Line	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Jamie Kendrick	Maryland Transit Administration	410-948-9444	jkendrick@mtatdd.com
Chuck Kines	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2184	Charles.Kines@montgomeryparks.org
Linda Komes	M-NCPPC, PDD	301-650-2860	Linda.komes@montgomeryparks.org
Mike Madden	Maryland Transit Administration	443-451-3718	mmadden@mta.maryland.gov
John Nissel	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	240-429-0355	John.nissel@montgomeryparks.org
Doug Redmond	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-384-2417	Doug.Redmond@montgomeryparks.org
Mike Riley	M-NCPPC, Department of Parks	301-495-2553	Mike.riley@montgomeryparks.org
Bill Tyler	M-NCPPC, Southern Region Parks		Bill.tyler@montgomeryparks.org
Michael Weil	National Capital Planning Commission	202-482-7253	Michael.weil@ncpc.gov
Melissa Williams	M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Planning	301-495-4642	Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org



**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation**  
**Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**Parkside Headquarters**  
**9500 Brunett Avenue**  
**Silver Spring, Maryland**  
**Wednesday, May 16, 2012 at 10:30 AM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC  
Mr. Michael Weil, NCPC

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda

**1. Overview of refinements made to the Preferred Alternative since the previous meeting**

The Purple Line GEC Team provided a brief overview of the refinements made to the proposed alignment since the previous meeting. The Purple Line team proceeded to review each park, from west to east.

**2. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings, M-NCPPC is in the process of redesigning Elm Street Urban Park. The park will be completely redesigned in the future, though no timeline was provided. M-NCPPC is overseeing the design of the park. All of the renderings of the proposed reconstructed park have been provided to the Purple Line Team. The team has been working with M-NCPPC and Montgomery County in an effort to construct access to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail in an effort to minimize any potential impacts to the park.

Instead of running the proposed CCT underground, it would end at Elm St. Urban Park. At this point, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation is in the process of planning a surface trail that would continue the trail from the connection to Elm Street Urban Park, along Waverly Avenue, and to Bethesda Avenue. Since the surface trail would be a Montgomery County project, additional impacts are not expected as a result of the proposed Purple Line Preferred Alternative.

A discussion of the existing conditions of the park was held. There are currently several trees along the northern boundary of the park, between the park and the Interim Capital Crescent Trail. The trees are located to the west of the existing and planned connection from the park to the trail. The trees are not high quality. From a planning



**General Engineering Consultant Team**  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Requardt and Associates JV  
801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231

and engineering perspective, the existing columns located under the Air Rights Building are a bigger constraint than the trees and park and would dictate where the trail connection would be located.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail.

Construction access would be through the Interim CCT. Construction impacts to the park would be minimized to the maximum extent possible.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. However, if the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited.

### **3. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the proposed project would be aligned completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur during construction for the construction of the trail and transitway, as well as construction equipment. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

At the meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that there are currently flooding and siltation issues to the Rock Creek Trail in the vicinity of the proposed project area. They requested that the Purple Line Team evaluate moving the trail away from the creek in this area in an attempt to alleviate these issues. In addition, they requested that the trail be raised to further reduce potential flooding.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to the park and trail.

### **4. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**

For documentation purposes, this park includes Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail. The Purple Line Team verified that this would be acceptable to M-NCPPC. The park is 543 acres in size, consists of seven different units, and encompasses the Sligo Creek floodplain. The park was purchased and developed using Capper-Crampton Act funding.

The proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue in the vicinity of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. In addition, the proposed Green Trail would be constructed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. Not only with the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Realigning the existing stream would be beneficial to the park and the surrounding area, as it would alleviate these flooding issues.





Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project. Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. It was determined during the meeting that WSSC is completing a lot of work within Sligo Creek. M-NCPPC will attempt to provide mapping of the stream upgrades.

Before a finding at this park can be determined, refinements with regard to access roads and tree loss are required. When the design of the proposed alignment is further refined in the vicinity of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, additional coordination with M-NCPPC will occur.

##### **5. Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park**

Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park would be evaluated as two separate parks. However, since the alignment and related issues would include the same discussion for both parks, both are included below.

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.05 acre of property and approximately 0.42 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Stream Valley Park. In addition, the Preferred Alignment would require the acquisition of approximately 0.025 acre of property and approximately 0.29 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However; some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be restricted. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the restricted access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road.

Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks.

M-NCPPC concurred that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to both Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park. However, as part of mitigation, they indicated that replanting would be required in this area. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

## **6. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard intersection. The transitway and station construction would require significant roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in permanent impacts, as well as significant temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.

The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store, located directly north of the park. In addition, the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Sector Plan is currently being developed for the proposed project area. M-NCPPC is interested in the identified displacement area directly to the north of the park for potential future parking. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park, which Montgomery County is currently lacking. Due to so many unknowns with regard to potential impacts and mitigation, a finding for this park is pending. M-NCPPC indicated that they may need to rethink the design of the park as the design is further refined, as the layout could potentially be significantly different than current conditions.

## **7. Next Meeting**

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park, Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, Long Branch Local Park, and Long Branch Stream Valley Park would all be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process.

Additional coordination would be required regarding anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.



**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



SIGN IN SHEET

Name	Company	Phone Number	E-mail Address



**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation**  
**Department Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**Parkside Headquarters**  
**9500 Brunett Avenue**  
**Silver Spring, Maryland**  
**Wednesday, November 21, 2012 at 1:00 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line GEC  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line GEC  
Mr. Doug Redmond, M-NCPPC

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda

**1. Overview of refinements made to the Preferred Alternative since the previous meeting**

The Purple Line GEC Team provided a brief overview of the refinements made to the proposed alignment since the previous meeting. The Purple Line team proceeded to review each park, and discuss parks in terms of impact findings previously discussed. The Purple Line Team supplied agendas for use by each meeting attendee, plan sized maps illustrating anticipated impacts to each park, and photographs of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park in the vicinity of the proposed project.

**2. Elm Street Urban Park**

As discussed in previous meetings, M-NCPPC is in the process of redesigning Elm Street Urban Park. The park will be completely redesigned in the future, though no timeline was provided. M-NCPPC is overseeing the design of the park. All of the renderings of the proposed reconstructed park have been provided to the Purple Line Team. The team has been working with M-NCPPC and Montgomery County in an effort to construct access to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail in an effort to minimize any potential impacts to the park. Construction access would be through the Interim CCT. Construction impacts to the park would be minimized to the maximum extent possible.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. Impacts would be a result of the construction of the access from the park to the proposed CCT. The proposed trail connection would be eight feet wide, but depending on park plans, could be widened to ten feet. Impacts would be temporary and would improve access to the park from the trail. The trail connection would be aerial over the transitway, where it would cross to parallel the transitway to the north. The pedestrian bridge over the transitway would be fenced within a boxed truss over the track.



**General Engineering Consultant Team**  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Requardt and Associates JV  
801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231

There were questions about the potential visual impacts of the proposed trail and transitway from Elm Street Urban Park. In the vicinity of the park, the proposed transitway would be constructed within the tunnel under the Air Rights Building. There would be walls constructed directly north of the park that would screen the view of the transitway from the park. The design of the walls would be consistent with what is proposed with the redevelopment of the Air Rights Building. The walls would end with a louver (a framed opening with movable horizontal slats for ventilation), directly west of the proposed trail connection from Elm Street Urban Park to the proposed Capital Crescent Trail. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed through the tunnel in lieu of a trail so that patrons could access the Purple Line or Metro's Red Line. In addition, the sidewalk would serve as an alternate means of crossing Wisconsin Avenue.

A rock garden currently exists between Elm Street Urban Park and the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail. There were discussions about potentially including landscaping between the Air Rights Building and the park. The rock garden could potentially be landscaped up to the louver area. This will be further explored and will be discussed at future agency coordination meetings.

M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to Elm Street Urban Park. However, if the design of the trail connection changes and results in impacts to the existing playground or the removal of trees, this finding would need to be revisited.

### **3. Rock Creek Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Rock Creek Stream Valley Park, the proposed project would be aligned completely within Montgomery County right-of-way. Construction would occur from Lyttonsville area in an effort to expedite construction in the vicinity of the park. Rock Creek National Recreational Trail would be detoured temporarily during construction in an effort to protect trail patrons. Extensive tree clearing would occur in order to perform the construction of the trail and transitway. This would result in increased visibility of the trail and transitway. The Purple Line Team is currently evaluating various options to connect the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail.

The design of the proposed connector trail from the proposed Capital Crescent Trail to existing Rock Creek Trail was discussed. The proposed trail connection would occur completely within Montgomery County right-of-way in an effort to minimize direct impacts to the park and natural resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. The engineering and construction of the trail was discussed and the team described why the proposed connection would work. Through the majority of the park, the proposed Capital Crescent Trail would be aligned to the south side of the proposed transitway. The trail would be constructed at a lower elevation than the transitway in an effort to preserve the viewshed within Rock Creek Stream Valley Park to the maximum extent possible. On the eastern side of the park, the trail would cross under the proposed transitway in a tunnel, where it would parallel the transitway to the north.

We revisited the previous discussion regarding potentially moving the Rock Creek Trail in an effort to reduce flooding and siltation issues that currently plague the trail. Moving the trail is not a feasible option because of the instability of slope to the south of the proposed transitway, the construction of the proposed trail and transitway and associated abutments, and the location of the Rock Creek floodplain. The M-NCPPC requested that the Purple Line Team evaluate potentially raising the trail, either by constructing a boardwalk or by some other means through the proposed project area. Elevating the trail would improve the functionality of the trail.

M-NCPPC questioned stormwater management measures within the park. Stormwater management facilities would not be constructed within the park, as this would result in an increase in impacts to park resources. As such, M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, since the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the park or any park facilities, it would result in *de minimis* impacts to the park and trail.

#### **4. Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park**

Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park would be evaluated as two separate parks. However, since the alignment and related issues would include the same discussion for both parks, both are included below. At the May 16, 2012 formal agency coordination meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project would result in *de minimis* impacts to both Long Branch Stream Valley Park and Long Branch Local Park. However, additional discussions with other M-NCPPC and Montgomery County staff after that meeting, it was determined that additional minimization measures would need to be evaluated before M-NCPPC would concur with *de minimis* impact determinations for either park. As part of mitigation, M-NCPPC indicated that replanting would be required within the parks to replace vegetation that would be removed as a result of the proposed project. In addition, they indicated that new sidewalks have been constructed along Garland Avenue, which is located directly west of the park. Access to those sidewalks would be maintained at all times during construction. They requested that construction be avoided during June and July, which are historically the busiest months for Long Branch Recreational Center.

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of Piney Branch Road, which abuts Long Branch Stream Valley Park to the north. Right-of-way would be required for the widening of Piney Branch Road to accommodate the proposed Purple Line. The roadway widening would include two dedicated lanes for the transitway, one in each direction, an 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide shared use lane for vehicle and bicycle use in each direction. Five-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on both north and south sides of Piney Branch Road.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.11 acre of property and approximately 0.36 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Stream Valley Park. In addition, the Preferred Alignment would require the acquisition of approximately 0.07 acre of property and approximately 0.24 acre of temporary construction easements from Long Branch Local Park. As part of the proposed project, the culvert that currently conveys Long Branch Stream beneath Piney Branch Road would be lengthened and a new parallel pipe would be constructed in an effort to better convey the stream and mitigate flooding that currently occurs frequently in this location. A majority of the proposed construction, including the extension of the culvert and construction of the new pipe, would occur from Piney Branch Road in an effort to minimize impacts to the park. Some tree removal would be required within the park along Piney Branch Road and the stream directly adjacent to the road for grading. However, some material storage and access through the existing parking lot may be required.

At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC indicated that there are a lot of problems within Long Branch Stream. The stream has a lot of erosion issues. In addition, flooding is frequent in the vicinity of Long Branch Stream Valley Park. M-NCPPC indicated that there are problems with non-native invasive tree species growing along the stream banks.

Five-foot wide sidewalks currently exist on either side of Piney Branch Road. The proposed project would include the construction of five-foot wide sidewalks to replace those that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. Montgomery County would like to construct 10-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road. M-NCPPC stated that the Sector Plan that is currently under development includes sidewalk widening to 10 feet along Piney Branch Road. The Purple Line Team indicated that while the current plans include the construction of



five-foot wide sidewalks on either side of Piney Branch Road, some measures could be taken to prepare the proposed project area for widened sidewalks in the future. Potential measures include raising the headwalls and wingwalls associated with the proposed culvert extension by 2 ½ feet so that sidewalk widening could be accommodated without impacting the extended culvert in the future.

Access to the Long Branch Community Center would be restricted. Access would be limited to right turns into and out of the community center. The reason for the restricted access is that traffic cannot cross the transitway at an unsignalized intersection. In addition, there is not enough room on Piney Branch Road to construct left turn lanes without substantially impacting buildings, which would be necessary to allow for left turns on Piney Branch Road. Therefore, patrons utilizing the community center from the west would need to make a u-turn at University Boulevard to access the community center. In addition, patrons wishing to travel eastbound from the community center would need to turn right onto Piney Branch Road and make a u-turn at Arliss Street to proceed eastbound on Piney Branch Road. Full access to the Long Branch Trail would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would include better signalized pedestrian crossings along Piney Branch, which would be beneficial to park patrons.

M-NCPPC stated that no left turns on Piney Branch Road would be unacceptable according to the Long Branch Sector Plan, which is currently under development. Approximately 300 to 400 people use the community center every day, so there is a need to access it. In addition, M-NCPPC indicated their opinion was that since the restricted access to and from the community center would be a direct result of the proposed Purple Line, MTA is responsible for remediating any potential impacts to access. M-NCPPC indicated that they didn't feel that all measures were thoroughly exhausted to minimize impacts to access to the Long Branch Community Center. They requested additional minimization and mitigation measures be evaluated. Suggested measures include the following:

- Further widen Piney Branch Road so that left turn lanes could be included in each direction;
- Potentially realign the entrance to the Community Center with Barron Street;
- Potentially relocate the Long Branch Community Center from its current location to the west, east of the intersection of Garland Avenue and Walden Road;
- Potentially construct an additional access road from Garland Avenue near the Long Branch Library along an existing pedestrian path. A recently reconstructed pedestrian bridge over Long Branch would need to be reconstructed to accommodate vehicular traffic; and

The construction of an additional Long Branch Community Center access road from University Boulevard to Langley Drive has been evaluated in the past by M-NCPPC and Montgomery County. However, that option was dismissed, as the access road would be through an existing residential area and would result in a significant increase in traffic within the neighborhood and affecting safety.

M-NCPPC requested that the Purple Line Team attempt to minimize tree loss within Long Branch Stream Valley Park, as the proposed limits of disturbance, as currently designed, appear to be a bit more generous than is necessary. The Team will further refine the temporary impacts, limits-of-disturbance, and tree removal within Long Branch Stream Valley Park.

The measures listed above will be further evaluated and discussed at the next meeting with M-NCPPC.

## **5. Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park**



For documentation purposes, this park includes Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail. The Purple Line Team verified that this would be acceptable to M-NCPPC. The park is 543 acres in size, consists of seven different units, and encompasses the Sligo Creek floodplain. The park was purchased and developed using Capper-Cramton Act funding.

The proposed project is aligned through the median of Wayne Avenue in the vicinity of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. In addition, the proposed Green Trail would be constructed from Silver Spring to Sligo Creek Parkway in this area, abutting Wayne Avenue to the north. Anticipated impacts to Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park were discussed with M-NCPPC. As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.25 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 1.48 acre of temporary impacts. In addition, a 0.03 acre sliver of land currently owned by Montgomery County that abuts Wayne Avenue to the south would be conveyed to M-NCPPC for use as park. Not only will the bridge on Wayne Avenue need to be reconstructed to accommodate the transit way, it would be moved slightly to the west to accommodate the realignment of Sligo Creek. Flooding is an issue within the proposed project area at this location. Realigning the existing stream would be beneficial to the park and the surrounding area, as it would alleviate these flooding issues. Full access to the park and facilities would be maintained at all times during construction. No park facilities would be affected by the proposed project.

Tree loss is proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project as a result of roadway widening, bridge reconstruction, and stream realignment. Mapping was presented at the meeting to illustrate proposed tree removal. Tree removal was determined as a combined result of aerial photography, engineering, and site reconnaissance to determine where trees currently exist that would need to be removed. It was determined during the meeting that WSSC is completing a lot of work within Sligo Creek. M-NCPPC will attempt to provide mapping of the stream upgrades.

The proposed access road located to the south of Wayne Avenue is currently a utility easement. This area was also used as an access road for WSSC to complete work in January 2012. Tree removal to the south of Wayne Avenue could potentially be further minimized. To the north of Wayne Avenue, parking within the park would be reconfigured and replaced as a result of the proposed project. There were concerns about potential impacts to Sligo Creek Parkway as a result of the roadway tie-ins. This had already been considered by the team, and the proposed tie-ins are relatively short.

M-NCPPC will have an internal meeting to discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. There will be further discussions between M-NCPPC and the Purple Line Team to discuss a potential *de minimis* impact finding.

## **6. New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, from Piney Branch Road, the proposed transitway would turn southbound onto University Boulevard, where it would be aligned through the middle of the roadway. The Piney Branch station is proposed for construction directly after the Piney Branch Road-University Boulevard intersection. The transitway and station construction would require roadway widening of University Boulevard in this location. The proposed alignment was shifted slightly to the east in an effort to minimize residential displacements.

As currently designed, the proposed project would result in 0.32 acre of permanent impacts, as well as 0.35 acre of temporary impacts. The existing parking lot would need to be removed, as roadway widening and sidewalk construction would impact half of the existing parking area. In addition, the construction of the proposed transitway would allow only right turns in and out of the park.



The proposed project would require the displacement of an existing grocery store and gas station, located directly north of the park. In addition, the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Sector Plan is currently being developed for the proposed project area. M-NCPPC has expressed an interest in the identified displacement area directly to the north of the park for potential future parking. In addition, there have been discussions about potentially construction a regulation size soccer field at the park. M-NCPPC indicated that the sector plan that is currently under development indicates that a loop road would be constructed through the park to provide access to private property to the north of the park. M-NCPPC stated that the park would be redeveloped, regardless of the proposed project. The park will be reclassified from a neighborhood park to community use/urban recreation park. Due to so many unknowns with regard to potential impacts and mitigation, a finding for this park is pending.

## **7. Next Meeting**

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Elm Street Urban Park and Rock Creek Stream Valley Park would be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process. Depending on refinements to the LOD, Long Branch Stream Valley Park could potentially be subject to *de minimis* impacts as well. Internal meetings between M-NCPPC will occur in December where they will further discuss the proposed project and anticipated impacts. Additional coordination would be required regarding anticipated impacts to Long Branch Local Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, and New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.



**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Evaluate possibly landscaping the existing “rock garden” between Elm Street Urban Park and the Air Rights Building		
2.	Evaluate potentially raising Rock Creek Trail in an effort to decrease flooding impacts and siltation. Look into potentially constructing a boardwalk.		
3.	Refine the LOD within Long Branch Stream Valley Park to determine if tree clearing can be minimized or if the LOD can be decreased		
4.	Long Branch Local Park- investigate potential left turns on Piney Branch Road		
5.	Potentially move Long Branch Community Center		
6.	Potentially construct a new access road into Long Branch Community Center		
7.	New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park- look into what they are planning to do with the parcels at corner of University Blvd and Piney Branch Road		
8.	Are there plans to close off access to the corner parcels from Piney Branch/University? If so, sector plan has potential loop road constructed through the park		
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Jim Guinther	Purple Line	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Harriet Levine	Purple Line	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Chuck Kines	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-495-2184	Charles.Kines@montgomeryparks.org
Doug Redmond	M-NCPPC Montgomery County Parks	301-384-2417	Doug.Redmond@montgomeryparks.org
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REGION III  
Delaware, District of  
Columbia, Maryland,  
Pennsylvania, Virginia,  
West Virginia

1760 Market Street  
Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4124  
215-656-7100  
215-656-7260 (fax)

December 8, 2011

Charles S. Kines, AICP  
Planner-Coordinator / Park Planning & Stewardship Division  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
Montgomery County Department of Parks  
9500 Brunett Avenue  
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Subject: Purple Line, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties  
Section 4(f) Resources – Montgomery County Parks

Dear Mr. Kines:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), is preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Purple Line transit project located in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland. The purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to begin formal coordination regarding the Purple Line project and its potential effects on the parks and properties within its jurisdiction.

The Purple Line would extend 16 miles, from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton, in Prince George's County. The Purple Line would connect Metrorail's Red Line (Bethesda and Silver Spring stations), Green Line (College Park station), and Orange Line (New Carrollton station). This project would provide transit options to people along the corridor, support economic development, and help address the region's air quality issues.

The attached map shows the Purple Line alignment, as well as park resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. As currently designed, the proposed project could potentially affect numerous resources along the proposed alignment. They are as follows:

- Elm Street Urban Park
- Leland Neighborhood Park
- Rock Creek Regional Park and Rock Creek Trail
- Metro Urban Park
- Sligo Creek Park- including Sligo Cabin Neighborhood Park, Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Units 1 and 2, and Sligo Creek National Recreational Trail
- Long Branch Stream Valley Park- including Long Branch Arliss Neighborhood Park, Long Branch Local Park, Long Branch Stream Valley Park, and Long Branch Trail
- New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park

- Paint Branch Stream Valley Park and Paint Branch Trail
- Proposed Green Trail

As part of the coordination effort, we would like to request any relevant, available information on the identified parks, such as park and trail master plans, and funding information that might be beneficial with regard to our research of these resources.

Please contact Tim Lidiak, FTA Environmental Planner (215-656-7084) or John Newton, MTA's Environmental Manager (410-767-3769) at your convenience to schedule the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance with this process.

Sincerely,



Michele Destra, Director  
Office of Planning & Program Development

Enclosure

cc: Mike Madden, MTA  
John Newton, MTA  
Leslie Roche, PMC  
Steve Hawtof, GEC  
Amanda Baxter, GEC



Purple Line GEC  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Parks and Recreation  
Department  
1109 Spring Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Silver Spring, Maryland  
Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at 1:30 PM

### MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDEES: Mr. David Anspacher, M-NCPPC Planning  
Mr. Tom Autry, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Brooke Farquhar, M-NCPPC Parks  
Mr. Rob Gibbs, M-NCPPC-PPSD  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line Team  
Mr. Charles Kines, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Linda Komes, M-NCPPC PPD  
Mr. Darien Mauley, M-NCPPC Park Police  
Ms. Monica Meade, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Mitra Pedoeem, M-NCPPC PPD  
Mr. Stephen Reid, M-NCPPC PDD  
Mr. Brian Riffel, Purple Line Team  
Mr. Bob Turnbull, M-NCPPC PPSP  
Mr. Brian Woodward, M-NCPPC Southern Parks

### LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Agenda

On Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at 1:30 PM, members of the Purple Line Team met with several representatives of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) from Montgomery County.

The meeting opened with introductions. Meeting attendees included Kristi Hewlett (Purple Line), Brooke Farquhar (M-NCPPC), David Anspacher (M-NCPPC Planning), Brian Riffel (Purple Line), Monica Meade (Purple Line), Stephen Reid (M-NCPPC PPD), Bob Turnbull (M-NCPPC/PPSD), Darien Mauley (M-NCPPC Park Police), Rob Gibbs (M-NCPPC/PPSD), Steve Hawtof (Purple Line), Tom Autry (M-NCPPC), Chuck Kines (M-NCPPC/Parks), Linda Komes (M-NCPPC/PPD), Brian Woodward (M-NCPPC Southern Parks), and Mitra Pedoeem (M-NCPPC/PDD). Chuck Kines facilitated the meeting. He started out by asking what the current status is of the proposed project. Monica Meade gave a brief overview of where we currently stand. She indicated that we are hoping to officially enter the Preliminary Engineering phase of the project by the end of August or beginning of September. Steve Hawtof elaborated on the status of the project. Mr. Hawtof indicated that we have started working on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and are working with the design team to identify critical areas from an environmental standpoint.

Mr. Kines stated that there was a meeting with the Purple Line Team on July 12, 2011 where members of the Purple Line Team asked for guidance on trail access issues. He stated that the Purple Line Team is working on a white paper for the Capital Crescent Trail that will identify the major issues where guidance from Montgomery County is necessary. The Purple Line Team will be writing the white papers and will provide them to Montgomery County for review and comment. The white papers will be presented to the Planning Board in a meeting on September 22. Issues to be identified in the white papers include the following:

- The construction of the portion of the Capital Crescent Trail through the Bethesda Tunnel
- Fire and rescue
- Lighting throughout the length of the Capital Crescent Trail
- Safety and Security
- Surveillance
- Emergency Communication (call boxes)
- The surface materials that will be used to construct the trail
- Whether the MTA would provide fencing that would separate both private and park properties from the Purple Line
- Landscaping- from a community standpoint, landscaping along the trail and park properties is very important.

Safety and security is a fairly significant issue with regard to the Capital Crescent Trail. Two County and one park police officer met to try to determine who would be responsible for patrolling the Capital Crescent Trail and how patrols will be allocated among the agencies. Park police indicated that the existing Capital Crescent Trail is unique in that it is the only trail that is open and patrolled continuously. At this early stage, they are discussing potentially patrolling the trail by segway. If that is the chosen method of patrol, numerous additional factors would come into play, including staffing, call boxes, locations for charging and storing the segways, and lighting for the entire trail. The attendees were reminded that the cost of the trail and features is a County responsibility.

At this point, the discussion turned to Elm Street Urban Park and the proposed connection from the Capital Crescent Trail to the park. M-NCPPC plans to completely reconstruct the park. The Purple Line plans have always included a trail connection to Elm Street Urban Park. The design team is working with M-NCPPC to take their park plans into account when planning the trail.

Brian Riffel provided an overview of the proposed plans for the Purple Line beginning at Bethesda and ending in the vicinity of the park. He included a discussion of where the plans currently stand, including where the Purple Line would enter the station, location of the station, the location of elevators to the Red Line, and other applicable plans. The Capital Crescent Trail would be elevated over the Purple Line in the Bethesda area.

Mr. Riffel discussed potentially constructing the connection from the trail to the park in the location of the existing connection, which is located on the eastern side of the park. Given the final proposed elevation of the Capital Crescent Trail as compared to Elm Street Urban Park, a connection from the trail to the park would be a fairly steep five-percent grade. However, if the connection is moved to the western side of the park, the elevation of the park is slightly higher and closer to the elevation of the Capital Crescent Trail. A western connection would

require a two-percent grade. It was agreed that the location of the connector trail should be moved to the west and made to fit between the existing building columns.

Linda Komes (M-NCPPC) questioned what the proposed width of the connector trail would be. Mr. Riffel stated that as currently designed, the connector would be 12 feet wide, which is the standard width of the Capital Crescent Trail in this area. However, the width of the connector trail could be reduced to eight or 10 feet. It was noted that the trail in the park is eight feet wide. The width of the trail connection does not need to be decided at this time. Mr. Riffel stated that most of the connector trails along this portion of the project area would be 10 feet wide. It was suggested that if the Elm Street Park connector is the "official" route of the trail for any length of time, such as during tunnel construction or if the trail is constructed within the tunnel at a later date, the trail might need to be wider to handle the expected trail use.

The discussion turned to existing plans for building owners to potentially redevelop their properties. The discussion was limited strictly to the APEX and Air Rights Buildings. If the owners redevelop their respective properties, the western terminus of the Capital Crescent Trail could be affected. The trail could end at Elm Street Urban Park if the proposed development of the buildings is concurrent with the construction of the Purple Line.

More questions were raised regarding potentially having two separate plans for the connector trail. Another idea was raised to potentially reorient the trail. As currently designed, the trail leads straight into the park. One of the ideas that was to reorient the trail so that instead of leading straight into the park, trail users would be aimed toward Bethesda, which is where many of the trail users work. This would eliminate the 90-degree turn for trail users, which would be better for cyclists. However, it was suggested that we may want to keep the turn in an effort to slow the trail uses. Mr. Riffel explained that as we work toward final design, we have the flexibility to connect to the Park trail in different ways and will coordinate the final orientation of the trail as the project moves forward, as either option would be acceptable with regard to the Purple Line. Linda Komes indicated that the best case scenario with regard to the schedule of reconstructing Elm Street Urban Park is 2013.

The discussion moved on to Rock Creek Regional Park and the proposed connection from Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail. Mr. Riffel provided an overview of the various trail connections that the design team created in an effort to reduce impacts to natural resources. A more direct connection from the Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail is proposed to make the transition between trails easier. Directly east of the Jones Mill Road underpass, a trail switchback is proposed from the Capital Crescent Trail to Jones Mill Road. Regardless of which trail connection option is selected, the connection from the trail to Jones Mill Road would be constructed. During the DEIS, a trail connection from Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail was proposed. The original connection would have been a switchback type connection that would connect from the south side of the Capital Crescent Trail and move toward the east, turn back on itself and connect to the Rock Creek Trail. Due to design changes resulting from changes to the proposed location of the Lyttonsville Yard and Shop and the relocation of the trail to the north side of the transitway, the connector trail has been moved to the north side of the trail.

Five separate connector trail options were shown at the meeting with a fact sheet that gave an overview of each option. Since the connector trails are at the preliminary conceptual stages, impacts are not yet known.

Option 1 is the Susanna Lane Existing Connection. The length of this trail would be approximately 1,868 feet. The trail is currently signed from Jones Mill Road, on to Susanna Lane to a connector trail into the park. Some, but not all, of Susanna Lane has sidewalks. Approximately 1,000 feet of additional paved trail and sidewalk would be provided along Susanna Lane until it reached the existing trail connection to the Park. At this point, an existing footpath would be improved through Rock Creek Regional Park to connect to Rock Creek Trail. Since the trail would utilize an existing connection through a residential community, there would be no new park impacts. Impacts to natural resources would be minimal. It is not clear the extent of the improvements that the Purple Line would provide.

Option 2 is the Rock Creek Switch Back. This option is a variation of the switch back evaluated previously. It would be located to the north of the proposed Purple Line and is discussed above. The total length of this option is approximately 797 feet. Mr. Riffel explained that the Purple Line would be at a lower elevation and the trail even lower than the tracks, which would mean a shorter trail connection and fewer switchbacks to meet ADA compliance. The top of the existing railroad berm is not wide enough to accommodate both tracks and the trail. In addition, a single track through this area would not sufficiently meet operational demands.

Option 3 is the Susanna Lane New Connection. The length of this connection is approximately 1,153 feet. This connection would require users to access the western switchback, where it would connect to existing sidewalks on Susanna Lane. On Susanna Lane, there is a narrow, open, linear parcel of land that is currently owned by Montgomery County. A new trail would be constructed from Susanna Lane through Rock Creek Regional Park, where it would require a bridge to cross Rock Creek, and connect to Rock Creek Trail. This option would require a completely new connection through previously undeveloped parkland.

Option 4 is the Brookville Road Connection. The length of this connection is approximately 1,762 feet. This trail would connect to the Capital Crescent Trail directly east of the entrance to the existing County Bus Facility and Maintenance Yard. This option would require a completely new connection through previously undeveloped parkland. The elevation drop in this portion of the park is fairly significant. Therefore, a steep trail grade with numerous landings, as well as retaining walls, would be required in order to meet ADA compliance within Rock Creek Regional Park. Additional parkland impacts and possibly right-of-way would be required in order to meet this trail connection.

Option 5 is the Grubb Road Connection. The length of this connection is approximately 1,634 feet. This is generally the location of a signed trail connection today, with the construction of a new pedestrian bridge over the transitway to connect the trail, now on the north side. It uses existing roadways through a residential community to connect to Rock Creek Trail. This connection would begin to the east of Rock Creek Regional Park, south of the existing County Bus Facility and Maintenance Yard. A short switchback would be necessary from the trail to the south, toward the Grubb Road-Terrace Drive intersection. The trail would follow Terrace Drive to Freyman Drive, where a new portion of trail would be constructed on existing County right-of-way. The County currently has an agreement with a local synagogue to allow users to cross a parking lot to get to Rock Creek Park. The trail would then connect to the Rock Creek Trail south of the Purple Line. There are currently signs in this area directing trail users toward the trail in the vicinity of this connection.

Ms. Pedoeem questioned why additional options were developed for analysis if two trail connections already exist. Ms. Meade stated that since the beginning of the planning stages of the Purple Line, a new connection between the trails has been included. However, an additional option may be an easier, new, more direct connection than what is currently used. Mr. Kines questioned what the anticipated impacts associated with the Option 2 would be. Until the limit of disturbance is clearly established, the amount of impacts cannot be determined for any of the options. Mr. Kines indicated that until the anticipated impacts are determined, we need to continue to evaluate Option 2.

Ms. Pedoeem questioned the removal of the trestle bridge that currently carries the Capital Crescent Trail over Rock Creek and the Rock Creek Trail. Ms. Pedoeem thought the existing bridge would accommodate the proposed Purple Line and Capital Crescent Trail without the need to remove the bridge or widen the existing trail area. In addition, she also thought that the elevation of the Purple Line would remain unchanged. It was confirmed by Mr. Kines that the existing bridge was built as a temporary pedestrian bridge and could not handle the weight of a light rail train. Ms. Pedoeem asked if the Purple Line Team considered keeping the existing trestle bridge and footprint so that anticipated impacts do not increase. Ms. Meade indicated that the existing right-of-way in this area is 225 feet wide. As currently proposed, the Purple Line would be double tracked through this area. Mr. Kines stated that the single track vs. double track issue was discussed with the Planning Board. Mr. Riffel illustrated the existing width vs. what is required to accommodate both tracks and the trail. The question was raised again about the width of the connector trails. Along the Capital Crescent Trails, all of the connector trails would be 10 to 12 feet wide.

Some additional options were raised by M-NCPPC staff and discussed briefly during the meeting. Mr. Anspacher indicated that there are two existing connections from the Capital Crescent Trail to Rock Creek Trail. Mr. Anspacher stated that if those connections exist and are ADA compliant, why not construct stairs between the trails as a more direct connection. Another option that was raised was to construct the connector trail under the Capital Crescent Trail, over Rock Creek.

Stephen Reid requested that the Purple Line Team look at a direct connection from the switchback at Jones Mill Road, closely paralleling the trail, inside the County right-of-way.

The County rejected the new Susannah Lane option and the Brookville Road connections as too impactful because they would fragment the park and result in additional impacts to the park. In addition, the Brookville Road connection was considered too steep and unattractive. Susanna Road is duplicative of the existing Susannah Road connection.

Mr. Riffel indicated that details for Option 2 should be more advanced by the end of August. In addition, the design team would determine whether a straight connection or switchback would result in less impacts. It was also mentioned that the County may not have the funding to construct the connection when the time comes, so that is something that needs to be considered when selecting the connection.

Another consideration is to evaluate an interim vs. a long term connection. Mr. Kines requested that we not drop Option 2, as there would be high demand and a high potential number of users that would utilize that connection.

Mr. Kines said he does not have a problem deferring the construction of a direct switchback connection to a later time if the Purple Line Team can build the project so as not to preclude future construction of the switchback. This would also help the County by removing the cost of the connection from the initial construction of the trail. Mr. Kines was not particularly concerned about the impacts of tree removal from the side of the berm for the switchback because it is likely that much, if not all, of the vegetation would be removed during the trail and transitway construction.

M-NCPPC as a whole indicated that the options that would further fragment the parks should be dropped from further consideration. As such, Options 3 and 4 have been dropped from further consideration. The design team will try to decrease impacts associated with Option 2 as the grading and limit of disturbance is developed. In addition, Options 1 and 5 will be further evaluated.

There were a few other issues that were discussed at the meeting. Mapping had previously indicated that a parcel of park property was located at the proposed Lyttonsville Yard and Shop. M-NCPPC indicated that they own an acre of property there, but it is currently used for parking and not considered parklands.

Kristi Hewlett and Mr. Hawtof indicated that there appears to be a small, local park along the western portion of the Purple Line alignment, located at the intersection of Sleaford Road and Kentbury Drive. It is a small, common area that is maintained by East Bethesda residents. It is identified as Sleaford Park. Ms. Meade indicated that it is county right-of-way, a paper road on both sides of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. It is not a public park and local residents maintain it.

M-NCPPC owns a parcel of property at the Silver Spring Transit Center, previously identified as the Metro Urban Park. The Purple Line is elevated to the third or fourth floor of the Transit Center. Therefore, the Purple Line would have no impact on that parcel of land.

A floodplain study is currently being conducted for Sligo Creek. The results of this study are pending.

Ms. Pedoeem questioned how the Purple Line would impact the proposed Green Trail, which would be aligned to the north of Wayne Avenue near Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park. Ms. Meade stated that the Purple Line Team had worked with the County on the plans for the Green Trail. It was agreed that since this area, located outside of the Silver Spring Central Business District, the proposed trail could be an eight-foot wide shared use trail/sidewalk. The Purple Line plans show this wide trail/sidewalk on the north side of Wayne Avenue. It was also mentioned that a white paper exists for the Green Trail. Ms. Pedoeem also asked what speed the light rail will travel. The light rail cars will travel at the posted speed, along with automobile traffic.

In conclusion, we discussed the next steps. The design team will further evaluate Rock Creek Trail, including a limit of disturbance as well as renderings. The Purple Line Team will evaluate how the project could be designed to allow later connection of the connection. Options 1 (existing Susannah Lane) and 5 (existing Freyman Drive) will be retained as well. In addition, Mr. Reid's idea will be evaluated.



Ms. Pedoeem questioned the aesthetics of the bridge. Mr. Hawtof indicated that the Purple Line Team would be working with the National Capital Planning Commission, M-NCPPC, and architects to evaluate bridge designs from a visual perspective.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.





---

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Further evaluate Rock Creek Trail Option 2, including LOD and renderings		
2.	Evaluate how trail connection can be delayed		
3.	Further evaluate Rock Creek Trail Options 1 and 5		
4.	Evaluate a potential connection from Jones Mill Road to Rock Creek Trail		
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



SIGN IN SHEET

Name	Company	Phone Number	E-mail Address
David Anspacher	M-NCPPC Planning		
Tom Autry	M-NCPPC		
Brooke Farquhar	M-NCPPC Parks		
Rob Gibbs	M-NCPPC-PPSD		
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line Team		
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line Team		
Charles Kines	M-NCPPC		
Linda Komes	M-NCPPC PPD		
Darien Mauley	M-NCPPC Park Police		
Monica Meade	Purple Line Team		
Mitra Pedoeem	M-NCPPC PPD		
Stephen Reid	M-NCPPC PDD		
Brian Riffel	Purple Line Team		
Bob Turnbull	M-NCPPC PSD		
Brian Woodward	M-NCPPC Southern Parks		

**Prince George's County M-NCPPC/Purple Line Formal Agency Coordination Kickoff**  
**Meeting**

**Friday, January 6, 2012**

**12:00 - 2:00 PM**

**M-NCPPC Prince George's County Headquarters**

**6600 Kenilworth Avenue, Riverdale MD**

**Meeting Minutes**

On Friday, January 6, 2012, various members from the Purple Line Team, Prince George's County Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), and Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) met to discuss the proposed Purple Line and anticipated impacts to various parks and recreational resources along the proposed corridor. The following were in attendance:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Harriet Levine	Purple Line Team	<a href="mailto:Harriet.Levine@jacobs.com">Harriet.Levine@jacobs.com</a>
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line Team	<a href="mailto:Kristi.Hewlett@jacobs.com">Kristi.Hewlett@jacobs.com</a>
Chuck Montrie	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:chuck.montrie@pgparks.com">chuck.montrie@pgparks.com</a>
Eileen Nivera	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:eileen.nivera@pgparks.com">eileen.nivera@pgparks.com</a>
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line Team	<a href="mailto:shawtof@gfnet.com">shawtof@gfnet.com</a>
Joe O'Neill	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:joe.oneill@pgparks.com">joe.oneill@pgparks.com</a>
Steve Lowe	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:steven.lowe@pgparks.com">steven.lowe@pgparks.com</a>
Rodney Miller	Purple Line Team	<a href="mailto:rlmiller@gfnet.com">rlmiller@gfnet.com</a>
Calvin Savoy	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:calvin.savoy@pgparks.com">calvin.savoy@pgparks.com</a>
Jim Guinther	Purple Line Team	<a href="mailto:jguinther@wrallp.com">jguinther@wrallp.com</a>
Jerry Haynes	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:jerry.haynes@pgparks.com">jerry.haynes@pgparks.com</a>
Russell Carroll	PG County DPW&T	<a href="mailto:rjcarroll@co.pg.md.us">rjcarroll@co.pg.md.us</a>
Lou Farber	PG County DPW&T	<a href="mailto:lfarber@co.pg.md.us">lfarber@co.pg.md.us</a>
Stephanie Neal	M-NCPPC	<a href="mailto:stephanie.neal@pgparks.com">stephanie.neal@pgparks.com</a>

The meeting was kicked off with introductions. Ms. Harriet Levine provided a brief background of the proposed project, as well as a description of the proposed route. Section 4(f) and its purpose was defined for the group. Mr. Lou Farber questioned what, exactly, would constitute a Section 4(f) failure. It was explained that Section 4(f) requires that feasible and prudent alternatives are developed to avoid any potential impacts to these resources. If an alternative is selected that results in detrimental impacts to Section 4(f) resources even though an alternative with less impacts exists, the requirements of Section 4(f) would not be met.

A park-by-park discussion was held, where each park that would be affected by the proposed project was described with regard to existing conditions and access. In addition, anticipated impacts to each park were discussed, as well as potential impact findings.

Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park is located along the North Branch of the Anacostia River, north and south of University Boulevard, between Riggs Road and Adelphi Road. This stream valley park also includes Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center, Adelphi Manor Community Recreation Center, and University Hills Neighborhood Park in the vicinity of the proposed project area. Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park and all of the related facilities are owned and maintained by M-NCPPC.

The proposed project would require right-of-way both north and south of University Boulevard. Northwest Branch Trail could be temporarily relocated during construction, but would remain fully open and accessible. All access points to the park would remain open.

University Hills Neighborhood Park, which is part of the Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park, includes a duck pond. Sediment and water quality issues currently exist within the duck pond as a result of runoff. M-NCPPC indicated that they would be interested in upgrading the duck pond to correct the water quality issues. This could provide a mitigation opportunity for the property requirements.

The construction of the proposed Purple Line would require the reconstruction of the bridge over the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River in order to safely and adequately support the project. Construction of the bridge would occur within the 100-year floodplain. Questions arose with regard to impacts to compensatory storage that could potentially result from filling in a portion of the floodplain. A longer bridge would be constructed if necessary to mitigate for impacts to compensatory storage.

Given the fact that none of the existing recreational facilities would be affected by the proposed project, the minimal amount of right-of-way along an existing roadway that would be needed, and potential mitigation measures, M-NCPPC and the Purple Line Team agreed that a *de minimis* impact finding would be sought for potential impacts to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. In addition, it was determined that all of the smaller community parks within the Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park that would be affected, as well as the Northwest Branch Trail, would be evaluated as one resource.

A short discussion of Paint Branch Stream Valley Park occurred. Existing mapping indicates that M-NCPPC does not own the property that abuts Paint Branch Parkway. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact Paint Branch Stream Valley Park.

The proposed alignment through Anacostia River Stream Valley Park remains in flux. Directly south of River Road, east of Haig Drive, and west of the existing stormwater management pond, M-NCPPC plans to eventually construct a recreational facility, possibly a futsal court. There are discussions about possibly utilizing this same location as a staging area during the construction

of the proposed project. Any potential recreation area that would be constructed in that location would be constructed after the completion of the Purple Line.

During the construction of the proposed project, the existing footpath that leads from Kenilworth Avenue along the south side and under River Road would be closed. The path would be replaced when construction is complete. In addition, during the construction of the River Road bridge over the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River, the existing Northeast Branch Trail would be detoured. The trail would be detoured along Haig Drive, across River Road, north into an existing parking lot, where the trail would reconnect to the existing Northeast Branch Trail. The parking lot is owned by the University of Maryland. The intersection of Haig Drive and River Road would be signalized. The signal would be installed prior to the trail detour.

There are several potential measures that can be taken to mitigate for impacts to Anacostia River Stream Valley Park. A stormwater management pond currently exists to the south of River Road, west of the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River, and north and east of Haig Drive. This stormwater management pond could potentially be expanded in an effort to further treat runoff and improve water quality. M-NCPPC indicated that they would like to potentially see recreational amenities added around this pond. Amenities mentioned could include the construction of a trail around the pond and benches. Amenities could be added to improve the visual aesthetics of the pond. It is currently undetermined whether the pond would be acquired and maintained by MTA or if it would remain M-NCPPC property and be kept as a park facility.

There was some discussion as to the potential impact finding for this park. M-NCPPC indicated that they would like to pursue a *de minimis* impact finding, but would need to see more details on the proposed stormwater management pond before they could make that decision. In addition, it was determined that all of the smaller community parks, as well as the Northeast Branch Trail, would be evaluated with one impact finding.

The proposed Glenridge Yard and Shop has been discussed with M-NCPPC previously. There was some internal debate within M-NCPPC as to whether the existing Northern Area Maintenance Office was considered a Section 4(f) resource. Since the facility is not a public park that is open to the public, although it is an important facility to M-NCPPC with regard to park maintenance, the facility itself is not considered a Section 4(f) resource.

The proposed loop alignment would result in impacts to the neighboring Glenridge Elementary School. It would require right-of-way from existing recreational facilities associated with the school. In addition, it would result in the closure of an existing soccer field. The linear alignment would avoid impacts to the school entirely. Both the loop and linear alignment would require extensive grading to lower the elevation of the yard and shop so that the elevation of the facility would be consistent with Veterans Parkway. Options for both the loop and linear alignments were developed with and without the construction of a significant retaining wall.

Only the recreational facilities at the school are considered Section 4(f) resources, not the entire school. The general consensus among the M-NCPPC staff was that the existing school fields need to be preserved, as they are a significant resource.

M-NCPPC stated that the construction of a retaining wall would not be a benefit to Glenridge Community Park. They stated that it would be more beneficial to the park to grade and reforest the slope.

Hazard category- Can I get some input here? Can't recall exactly what we discussed.

M-NCPPC indicated that they would like to negotiate mitigation plans for impacts to Glenridge Community Park. They will continue to evaluate the two yard and shop options and get back to the Purple Line Team with their preferred alignment.

**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission – Prince George's County Recreation and Parks**  
**Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**M-NCPPC Prince George's County Headquarters**  
**6600 Kenilworth Avenue**  
**Riverdale, Maryland**  
**Friday, March 15, 2013 at 1:30 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Ronnie Gathers, M-NCPPC- Prince George's County Department of Recreation and Parks  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Eileen Nivera, M-NCPPC - Prince George's County Department of Recreation and Parks  
Mr. Michael Weil, National Capital Planning Commission

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Park fact sheets
- Agenda

The meeting opened with brief introductions, followed by an overview of the previous park impact findings and anticipated impacts to each park. Park Fact Sheets, which included a discussion of anticipated impacts, were provided to each of the meeting attendees.

**1. Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park**

We discussed anticipated impacts along University Boulevard to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. Permanent impacts would be 0.80 acres and would be along both the north and south side of University Boulevard between West Park Drive and Temple Street. This is a slight increase from what was previously presented (0.57 acres). Land would be required for the widening of University Boulevard and associated sidewalk construction.

Temporary impacts would be 3.45 acres, both north and south of University Boulevard. This is a slight increase from what was previously presented (3.42 acres).

Both north and south of University Boulevard, between West Park Drive and Temple Street, the existing drainage ditches directly adjacent to University Boulevard would be relocated to convey discharge toward Northwest Branch Stream. A retaining wall would be constructed near the eastern end of an existing drainage ditch located directly east of West Park Drive in an effort to maintain the ditch and avoid the disturbance of the embankment that supports the existing pond, located to the north of the proposed wall. Northwest Branch Stream would be temporarily impacted approximately 125 feet upstream to 125 feet downstream of University Boulevard to accommodate any stream diversion measures that would be necessary for the construction of the new bridge

The limit of disturbance was expanded to the north of University Boulevard to maintain positive drainage to Northwest Branch Stream from an existing drainage swale that currently conveys stormwater from University



Boulevard to the stream. These efforts would improve water quality of Northwest Branch Stream. Areas that would be impacted as a result of stormwater management upgrades would be returned to M-NCPPC when construction is complete.

A temporary detour of Northwest Branch Trail from the eastern to western side of West Park Drive would be required during construction. Full access to the trail would be maintained during construction. Full access to the park and all facilities would be maintained at all times during construction.

The median between West Park Drive and Adelphi Road would be closed permanently, eliminating left turn movements. Westbound vehicles traveling on University Boulevard would have to make a u-turn at West Park Drive to access the existing playground within NWBSVP, east of Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center. Eastbound vehicles would have to make a u-turn at Adelphi Road to access the archery range located to the north of University Boulevard and west of Temple Street.

There were a few questions that arose during the meeting. NCPC requested information on the type of bridge that would be constructed over the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River. As currently designed, the structure would be a three span, steel plate girder bridge. The Purple Line Team is currently reviewing the structure with SHA and concrete options are being evaluated. The hydraulics of the stream cross section would control the bridge design opening.

M-NCPPC asked what the dimensions of the proposed retaining wall to the north of University Boulevard and east of West Park Drive would be. The wall would be approximately 160 feet long and 14 feet tall. They also asked what the distances of impact would be along University Boulevard (i.e., how far the sidewalk would be moved back from their existing locations).

NCPC requested that the Purple Line Team keep them informed regarding public involvement so that they can coordinate their efforts. NCPC indicated that they would post a link on their website regarding public involvement while the public involvement process is underway. M-NCPPC requested information regarding the distances of anticipated impacts within the park, including the length and width of barriers and retaining walls. They also requested information on who would maintain the swales and ditches upon completion of the proposed project. They would be maintained by either MTA or SHA.

There were discussions regarding proposed stream restoration efforts within the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River, located within Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. Dr. Mow-Soung Cheng with the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Programs has contacted NCPC and M-NCPPC regarding the proposed restoration. No information with regard to the extent of status of the stream restoration project was available.

M-NCPPC agreed that impacts to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park would still be considered *de minimis*. We informed them that a letter would be sent to them in the near future for their concurrence.

## **2. Anacostia River Stream Valley Park**

As currently designed, 1.2 acres of land would be permanently used. Permanent impacts would result from the construction of the transitway parallel to and directly south of River Road through proposed project area. Permanent impacts have not changed from what was previously discussed.

The proposed project would result in 2.76 acres of temporary use of park in this area. The change in temporary impacts is almost negligible from what was previously presented (2.77 acres). Temporary right-of-way impacts would result from the implementation of the staging area on a currently undeveloped parcel at southeast quadrant of University Research Court/Haig Drive-River Road Intersection. This staging area is needed to construct the proposed transitway bridge adjacent to River Road. Upon completion of construction, this parcel of land would be completely cleared and graded for use as a futsal court to be constructed by M-NCPPC at a later date. Additional temporary impacts would result from grading, vegetation removal, and the reconstruction of the trail that parallels River Road.

UMD recently completed the construction of a traffic circle at the intersection of River Road and University Research Court/Haig Drive. As discussed with the University, the construction of the proposed Purple Line would require the removal of the traffic circle and the introduction of a signalized intersection. It is possible that the construction of the traffic circle would require some existing park land and any excess property outside of the Purple Line right-of-way would be conveyed back to the park once the circle was removed.

Full access to park would be maintained during construction. Northeast Branch Trail would be temporarily detoured during construction to Haig Drive. The Northeast Branch Trail would be detoured to follow Haig Drive, where it would cross River Road at grade onto University Research Court and through University of Maryland property accessing an existing trail connection on the north side of River Road to reconnect to the existing trail. The aforementioned traffic circle would be removed and the intersection would be signalized prior to the construction of the proposed transitway and associated trail detour in an effort to ensure the safety of trail users. No permanent impacts to existing park facilities are anticipated during construction. No change in access to the park would occur in this area during construction.

At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC requested the distance between the existing River Road Bridge and the proposed transitway bridge, where they cross over Northeast Branch Trail. There were concerns that if there was not sufficient distance between the two bridges, there could potentially be an impact to ambient lighting on the trail under the bridges. After the previous meeting it was determined that as currently designed, the distance between the existing and proposed bridges would be between 15 and 18 feet, as the proposed transitway bridge and the River Road bridge are not completely parallel.

At the meeting, M-NCPPC requested the dimensions of the retaining wall proposed to the south of River Road, adjacent to the existing stormwater management pond. The wall would be approximately 290 feet long and would vary in height. The maximum height of the wall would be approximately 15 feet adjacent to the bridge abutment for the Anacostia River bridge crossing.

The proposed project would permanently use 1.20 acres (total park acreage is 794), which is 0.15% of the overall park. The trail would be temporarily relocated during construction in an effort to remove the potential for pedestrian safety issues. Otherwise, no temporary or permanent impacts are expected to the existing park facilities. Full access would be maintained to the park at all times during and after the completion of construction. The proposed project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the park. As currently designed, the proposed impacts to the park would meet the criteria for a *de minimis* impact finding, provided that M-NCPPC concurs. The M-NCPPC previously determined that the proposed project would result in a *de minimis* impact finding. They concurred that this anticipated finding still stands.

### **3. West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Recreation Center**

As was discussed in the previous meeting with M-NCPPC, the proposed project would require 0.13 acres of temporary right-of-way from the park to reconstruct an existing stormdrain that drains into Beaverdam Creek. Full access to the park would be maintained during and after construction and none of the existing park facilities would be affected during the construction of the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project would be subject to a temporary occupancy determination. As part of our agency coordination, it was relayed that we expect the concurrence letter for the temporary occupancy determination to be sent to M-NCPPC in the near future.

#### **4. Glenridge Community Park**

The Team presented the changes to the proposed yard and shop configuration since the previous meeting. As discussed with M-NCPPC, the Modified Linear Alignment was identified as the Preferred Alternative. Some retaining walls were added to the proposed alignment in an effort to reduce potential impacts to parks, streams, and woodland buffer located along the proposed boundaries of the facility. In an effort to further reduce impacts to parks and natural resources, a parking structure is proposed. Right of way impacts to the park would be both temporary and permanent. As currently designed, the proposed project would temporarily impact 0.37 acre and permanently impact 5.32 acres of land within Glenridge Community Park. In addition, 2.04 acres of land currently used as Northern Area Maintenance Office would be converted to parkland. The anticipated permanent and temporary impacts would both decrease from what was previously presented (7.24 acres and 0.56 acre, respectively). However, the amount of anticipated reclaimed parkland would also decrease from 2.67 acres to 2.04 acres.

There were discussions about the relocation of the exiting Northern Area Maintenance Office. M-NCPPC indicated that they were somewhat reluctant to seriously search for a new facility before funding for the construction of the Purple Line is either secured or clearer. Therefore, very little has been done to search for a potential new location. M-NCPPC stated that they would like assistance from the Purple Line Team in locating potential locations. The Purple Line Team will start researching excess state-owned land. M-NCPPC indicated that if funding for the Purple Line is secured and construction is started prior to the identification of a new permanent site for the Northern Area Maintenance Office, they acknowledged the need to potentially move to a temporary facility until a new one is identified. The Purple Line Team stated that we will include a search of existing state facilities that M-NCPPC could share, if necessary.

M-NCPPC asked what the height of the proposed retaining walls would be around the proposed Glenridge Maintenance Facility. As currently designed, the maximum height of the retaining walls would be approximately 20 feet.

No temporary or permanent impacts to the existing park facilities are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Full access would be maintained to the park at all times during and after the completion of construction. While the proposed project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the park, M-NCPPC could not commit to a *de minimis* impact finding.

#### **5. Potential Mitigation Measures**

We initiated a discussion of potential mitigation measures for park impacts. The total acreage of impacts to parks owned and maintained by M-NCPPC Prince George's County Department of Recreation and Parks would be 7.32 acres of permanent impacts and 6.71 acres of temporary impacts county-wide. The proposed replacement parkland within Glenridge Community Park (2.04 acres) would bring the total number of anticipated impacts to parklands within Prince George's County down to 5.28 acres.

Potential mitigation measures previously discussed with M-NCPPC included upgrading athletic fields within Glenridge Elementary School and potentially fixing the existing drainage issues; grading the proposed staging area at the southeast quadrant of Haig Drive-River Road intersection for use as a futsal court; the construction of pedestrian bridges, including one from neighborhoods to the fields with Anacostia River Stream Valley Park and one over the Anacostia River to Northeast Branch Trail, south of River Road; and add park amenities around the existing stormwater management pond directly south of River Road, including benches and possibly a trail. We asked for their input on potential replacement parkland, providing improvements to existing parks as mitigation, and potential areas that could be used as parkland, but adding conservation easements in an effort to mitigate potential tree loss. M-NCPPC also indicated that they would like to improve/upgrade an existing playground located within Adelphi Manor (Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park) in close proximity to the proposed project area.

## **6. Next Meeting**

The next steps include obtaining concurrence from M-NCPPC with de minimis impacts and continued discussions regarding potential mitigation measures and the relocation of the Northern Area Maintenance Office..



---

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

---

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Prepare for Purple Line Coordination meeting with M-NCPPC Directorate, to be held in late February 2013		
2.	Further evaluate alternatives that would further minimize access impacts to Long Branch Community Center.		
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



**SIGN IN SHEET**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Ronnie Gathers	M-NCPPC, Prince George's Department of Recreation and Parks	301-699-2522	ronnie.gathers@pgparks.com
Kristi Hewlett	Purple Line	410-230-6654	kristi.hewlett@jacobs.com
Harriet Levine	Purple Line	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Eileen Nivera	M-NCPPC, Prince George's Department of Recreation and Parks	301-699-2522	eileen.nivera@pgparks.com
Michael Weil	National Capital Planning Commission	202-482-7253	michael.weil@ncpc.gov

**Purple Line GEC**  
**Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission – Prince George's County Recreation and Parks**  
**Formal Agency Coordination Meeting**  
**M-NCPPC Prince George's County Headquarters**  
**6600 Kenilworth Avenue**  
**Riverdale, Maryland**  
**Thursday, June 7, 2012 at 1:00 PM**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**ATTENDEES:**

- Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line Team
- Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line Team
- Mr. Dan Koenig, FTA (Call in)
- Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line Team
- Mr. Steve Lowe, M-NCPPC
- Mr. Chuck Montrie, M-NCPPC
- Ms. Eileen Nivera, M-NCPPC
- Mr. Calvin Savoy, M-NCPPC

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda
- Graphics showing proposed alignment through each proposed park area

**1. Overview of refinements made to the Preferred Alternative since the previous meeting**

The Purple Line Team provided a brief overview of the refinements made to the proposed alignment since the previous meeting. For the benefit of those present and calling in, it was explained that the meeting was a continuation of an earlier coordination meeting, held on January 6, 2012 to discuss the necessary level of documentation required for each park and their impacts. It was reiterated that a *de minimis* impact finding is a procedural issue and would have no effect on the mitigation efforts for any park impacts. The Purple Line Team proceeded to review each park, from west to east.

**2. Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park**

The Preferred Alternative is aligned through the median of University Boulevard, which runs through Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. Right-of-way would be required for roadway widening to accommodate the proposed Purple Line along University Boulevard. Through Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park, two interior lanes would be dedicated to the proposed transitway. There would be two additional lanes in each direction, including one 11-foot wide vehicle lane and a 16-foot wide bicycle compatible outside lane. Six-foot wide sidewalks would be constructed on each side of University Boulevard.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 0.66 acre of property from Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park, directly north and south of University Boulevard. In addition, approximately 3.21 acres of temporary construction easements would be required. Anticipated temporary



construction easements would increase slightly as a result of additional stream work within the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River, which runs through the park.

A majority of the proposed temporary construction easements would be required as a result of stormwater management upgrades and grading. Both north and south of University Boulevard, between West Park Drive and Temple Street, the existing drainage ditches directly adjacent to University Boulevard would be relocated to convey discharge toward Northwest Branch Stream. Existing ditches would be reworked in an effort to improve water quality to the stream. A retaining wall would be constructed near the eastern end of an existing drainage ditch located directly east of West Park Drive in an effort to maintain the ditch and avoid the disturbance of the embankment that supports the existing pond, located to the north of the proposed wall. Northwest Branch Stream would be temporarily impacted approximately 125 feet upstream to 125 feet downstream of University Boulevard to accommodate any stream diversion measures that would be necessary for the construction of the new bridge. In addition, the limit of disturbance was expanded to the north of University Boulevard to maintain positive drainage to Northwest Branch Stream from an existing drainage swale that currently conveys stormwater from University Boulevard to the stream. These efforts would improve water quality of Northwest Branch Stream. Areas that would be impacted as a result of stormwater management upgrades would be returned to M-NCPPC when construction is complete.

The Northwest Branch Trail would be temporarily detoured from the eastern side to the western side of West Park Drive during construction. Full access to the trail would be maintained during construction. The Preferred Alternative would not temporarily or permanently use any other facilities associated with Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. Full access to the park, all sidewalks, and bicycle lanes would be maintained during construction. However, the median between West Park Drive and Adelphi Road would be closed permanently, eliminating left turn movements. Vehicles traveling west on University Boulevard would have to make a u-turn at West Park Drive to access the existing playground within Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park, east of Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center. Eastbound vehicles would have to make a u-turn at Adelphi Road to access the archery range located to the north of University Boulevard and west of Temple Street.

The median between West Park Drive and Adelphi Road would be closed permanently, eliminating left turn movements. WB vehicles traveling on University Boulevard would have to make a u-turn at West Park Drive to access the existing playground within the park, east of Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center. Eastbound vehicles would have to make a u-turn at Adelphi Road to access the archery range located to the north of University Boulevard and west of Temple Street.

The construction of the bridge would be completed in multiple stages in an effort to avoid road closures. Once the widening of University Boulevard is complete and travel lanes and sidewalks are established, all construction activities would occur within the median. M-NCPPC indicated that a popular Hispanic festival is held in September that utilizes all areas for parking.

M-NCPPC indicated that the proposed project in the vicinity of Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park would result in no use or disruption of existing park facilities. In addition, it would not result in additional burden to maintenance crews. M-NCPPC is in favor of a wider limit of disturbance in this area for water quality improvements. The Purple Line Team indicated that hydraulic improvements would be made in this area that would decrease the potential for flooding that would also improve many of the existing issues within the stream. Improvements would be made to increase water quality within the right-of-way while increasing the quantity of water conveyed by existing ditches. Along University Boulevard, wider, flat-bottom swales would be created. Impacts to trees would be minimized. A majority of the bridge construction would occur from the roadway in an

effort to further minimize anticipated impacts to the park. As a result, M-NCPPC concurred that as currently designed, they would support a *de minimis* impact finding for this park.

### **3. Paint Branch Stream Valley Park**

Paint Branch Stream Valley Park is located in close proximity to the Preferred Alternative. As currently designed, the proposed transitway would run on dedicated tracks to the west of Paint Branch Parkway, away from the park. As a result, no impacts to Paint Branch Stream Valley Park are anticipated.

### **4. Anacostia River Stream Valley Park**

In the vicinity of Anacostia River Stream Valley Park, the Preferred Alternative abuts River Road to the south on a separate, dedicated structure, then turns southbound onto Kenilworth Avenue. The University of Maryland is planning to construct a traffic circle at the intersection of River Road and University Research Court/Haig Road. As discussed with the University, the construction of the proposed Purple Line would require the removal of the traffic circle and the re-introduction of a signalized intersection. It is possible that the construction of the traffic circle will require some existing park land and any excess property outside of the Purple Line right-of-way would be conveyed back to the park once the circle was removed. The Preferred Alternative also includes the reconstruction of a trail that parallels River Road to the south, before turning north under River Road near the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River to access M-NCPPC property to the north of River Road.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would require the temporary use of 2.9 acres of Anacostia River Stream Valley Park in this area. Temporary right-of-way impacts would result from the implementation of the staging area on currently undeveloped parcel at southeast quadrant of Haig Drive-River Road Intersection. This staging area is needed to construct the new Purple Line bridge adjacent to River Road. Upon completion of construction, this parcel of land would be completely cleared and graded for use as a futsal court to be constructed by M-NCPPC at a later date. Additional temporary impacts would result from grading, vegetation removal, and the reconstruction of the trail that parallels River Road.

As currently designed, 1.22 acres of land would be permanently used. Permanent impacts would result from the construction of the transitway parallel to and directly south of River Road through proposed project area.

Full access to the park would be maintained during construction. No impacts to existing park facilities would occur during construction. There would be no change in access to the park in this area during construction. During construction, while full access to the Northeast Branch Trail would be maintained, it would be temporarily detoured during construction. The Northeast Branch Trail would be detoured to follow Haig Drive, where it would cross River Road at grade onto University Research Court and through University of Maryland property, accessing an existing trail connection on the north side of River Road to reconnect to the existing trail. Approval from the University of Maryland would be required to access the trail through University property, located to the north of River Road.

As a follow-up to the previous meeting, the Purple Line Team indicated that while they looked into potentially expanding the existing stormwater management pond located to the south of River Road and east of Haig Drive, the pond could not be expanded due to its location in proximity to the 100-year floodplain of the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River. However, the Team indicated that they would consider potentially adding amenities, such as a trail or sitting areas around the pond. A retaining wall would be constructed between the transitway and pond in an effort to avoid impacts to the pond.

M-NCPPC indicated that the gap between River Road and the transitway would need to be evaluated. Lighting would be an issue for the trail in this area and ambient light levels under the bridges need to be considered. The proposed access trail from River Road would be regraded under the River Road bridge, as the team would need to reconfigure the trail so that it is located outside of the track bed.

M-NCPPC mentioned potentially constructing a trail from the proposed station to the park and neighborhoods located to the west of the park. University of Maryland is currently working with the Town of Riverdale to develop the proposed trail.

M-NCPPC concurred that the proposed project would result in no use or negative impacts to Anacostia River Stream Valley Park or any existing park facilities. While tree clearing would be required, it would be minimized where possible and mitigated. As such, M-NCPPC stated that they would concur with a *de minimis* impact finding for Anacostia River Stream Valley Park.

## **5. Baltimore Washington Parkway**

A short discussion was held regarding the proposed project through Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Along the proposed alignment, the parkway is owned and maintained by the National Park Service (NPS). The Purple Line Team provided an update to M-NCPPC as to where coordination with NPS stands and indicated that an agreement has been reached regarding maintenance of traffic during construction and the style of the reconstructed bridges between the Purple Line Team and NPS.

## **6. Glenridge Community Park**

For the benefit of the meeting attendees, the Purple Line Team provided an overview of the Loop Alternative evaluated for the proposed Glenridge Yard and Shop, as well as the Linear Alignment. Changes to the proposed Linear Alignment since the previous meeting were discussed. The Purple Line Team indicated that they are in the process of potentially reprogramming both the Glenridge and Lyttonsville Yard and Shops in an effort to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency.

As currently designed, the Preferred Alternative would be aligned along the western side of southbound Veterans Parkway. A yard and shop is proposed for construction at the M-NCPPC's existing Northern Area Maintenance Office (NAMO). At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC stated that their preference was for the Linear Alignment without the construction of retaining walls, as this alignment would avoid impacts to Glenridge Elementary School and the existing athletic fields located on school property. The alternative that is being carried forward is the Modified Linear alignment with the construction of some retaining walls in an effort to reduce potential impacts to park, including a stream and woodland buffer. While the yard and shop would be constructed primarily on property owned by M-NCPPC and within the NAMO, it would extend outside of the existing facility into Glenridge Community Park, as well as a parcel owned by Roswil Homeowners Association that is currently undeveloped, and B-1 County Center, who owns the access road that parallels Veterans Parkway.

The Purple Line Team discussed changes to the proposed yard and shop that are currently under consideration. Some of the changes include the construction of a larger building, which would allow for more indoor storage. As a result, the outdoor storage tracks would be smaller, which would reduce the limit of disturbance. In addition, more of the activities that would occur as a result of day-to-day operations would occur inside the building instead of outside where the activities would be more visible. In addition, the Purple Line Team is evaluating potentially constructing a parking deck instead of all surface parking in an effort to further reduce the limit of disturbance.

Modifications have been and are being made to the proposed yard and shop in an effort to minimize tree loss within the northwest portion of the park.

Right-of-way impacts would be both temporary and permanent. The Preferred Alternative would result in the permanent closure of an existing access road currently used as a back entrance to the Glenridge Shopping Center. The Modified Linear Alignment would not impact Glenridge Elementary School. The Modified Linear Alignment would allow the proposed Purple Line to convey excess land back to M-NCPPC to be used for park purposes. The fields at the school have high value for M-NCPPC. Along the eastern boundary of the proposed yard and shop, the land to be conveyed back to recreational uses would allow for a second regulation size field at the school and space to address existing drainage issues.

Full access to Glenridge Community Park would be maintained during construction. As currently designed, the Modified Linear alignment would not impact any existing park facilities currently used for active recreation purposes within Glenridge Community Park or Glenridge Elementary School. The proposed facility would be at a lower elevation than the adjacent park and school fields which will reduce any potential visual or noise effects and allow for fencing and landscaping.

Before determining a finding for Glenridge Community Park, the design of the proposed yard and shop will be refined and new impact numbers will be determined. A separate meeting will be held with M-NCPPC to discuss the alignment and potential finding for this park.

## **7. West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Park**

In the vicinity of West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Park, the Preferred Alternative is aligned along the western side of Veterans Parkway. It turns east onto Ellin Road, where it would be aligned to the south of the road. No permanent impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. However, a 0.13 acre temporary construction easement would be required from West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Park to relocate Beaverdam Creek, an existing stream that abuts the park to the south and follows the western side of the park, between the park and Veterans Parkway. Three options are currently being evaluated to relocate Beaverdam Creek slightly to the east in the vicinity of the park.

Full access to the park would be maintained during construction. None of the existing park facilities would be affected during construction as a result of the proposed project. As a result, M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with a *de minimis* impact finding for West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Park.

## **8. Next Meeting**

M-NCPPC indicated that they would concur with the Federal Transit Administration finding that Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park, Anacostia Valley Stream Valley Park, and West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Park would all be subject to *de minimis* impact findings. As such, after the conclusion of the meeting, the Purple Line Team would continue with the required *de minimis* coordination process.

Additional coordination would be required to further evaluate impacts resulting from the proposed Glenridge Yard and Shop. In addition, coordination for mitigation and minimization will be ongoing between the Purple Line Team and M-NCPPC.



---

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

---

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.	Approval from the University of Maryland to access the Northeast Branch Trail from University Research Court		
2.	Evaluate the gap between the River Road and transitway bridges to determine ambient lighting on the trail		
3.	Refine alignment of the proposed Glenridge Yard and Shop; schedule additional meeting to discuss refinements, anticipated impacts, and potential finding		
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



SIGN IN SHEET

Name	Company	Phone Number	E-mail Address

Purple Line GEC  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission – Prince George’s County Recreation and Parks  
Formal Agency Coordination Meeting  
M-NCPPC Prince George’s County Headquarters  
6600 Kenilworth Avenue  
Riverdale, Maryland  
Monday, October 8, 2012 at 10:00 AM

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDEES: Mr. Jim Guinther, Purple Line Team  
Mr. Bill Gordon, M-NCPPC- NAM- Fairland  
Mr. Steve Hawtof, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Kristi Hewlett, Purple Line Team  
Ms. Harriet Levine, Purple Line Team  
Mr. Steve Lowe, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Eileen Nivera, M-NCPPC  
Ms. Carol Ann Perovshek, M-NCPPC – DPR – PPD  
Mr. Roger Richardson, M-NCPPC – NAM – Glenridge  
Mr. Calvin Savoy, M-NCPPC

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Agenda
- Graphics showing proposed alignment through each proposed park area

1. De minimis process

Harriet Levine and Kristi Hewlett provided an overview of de minimis impact findings and the de minimis process. A finding of de minimis impact can be made only if the official with jurisdiction over resource concurs that the project “would not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes” that make a resource eligible for protection under Section 4(f).

The process for determining de minimis was explained for the attendees. It was explained that the team avoided and minimized impacts to the maximum extent possible. In order to obtain de minimis, written agency concurrence is required, followed by an opportunity for public input. It was also discussed that de minimis requires a separate public involvement process, above and beyond what would be required for a resource with a direct use.

2. Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park

We discussed anticipated impacts along University Boulevard to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park. Permanent impacts would be 0.57 acres and would be along both the north and south side of University Boulevard between West Park Drive and Temple Street. This is a slight decrease from what was previously presented (0.66 acres). Land would be required for the widening of University Boulevard and associated sidewalk construction.



General Engineering Consultant Team  
Gannett Fleming/Whitman, Reardon and Associates JV  
801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231



Temporary impacts would be 3.42 acres, both north and south of University Boulevard. This is a slight increase from what was previously presented (3.21 acres).

Both north and south of University Boulevard, between West Park Drive and Temple Street, the existing drainage ditches directly adjacent to University Boulevard would be relocated to convey discharge toward Northwest Branch Stream. A retaining wall would be constructed near the eastern end of an existing drainage ditch located directly east of West Park Drive in an effort to maintain the ditch and avoid the disturbance of the embankment that supports the existing pond, located to the north of the proposed wall. Northwest Branch Stream would be temporarily impacted approximately 125 feet upstream to 125 feet downstream of University Boulevard to accommodate any stream diversion measures that would be necessary for the construction of the new bridge

The limit of disturbance was expanded to the north of University Boulevard to maintain positive drainage to Northwest Branch Stream from an existing drainage swale that currently conveys stormwater from University Boulevard to the stream. These efforts would improve water quality of Northwest Branch Stream. Areas that would be impacted as a result of stormwater management upgrades would be returned to M-NCPPC when construction is complete.

A temporary detour of Northwest Branch Trail from the eastern to western side of West Park Drive would be required during construction. Full access to the trail would be maintained during construction. Full access to the park and all facilities would be maintained at all times during construction.

The median between West Park Drive and Adelphi Road would be closed permanently, eliminating left turn movements. WB vehicles traveling on University Boulevard would have to make a u-turn at West Park Drive to access the existing playground within NWBSVP, east of Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center. EB vehicles would have to make a u-turn at Adelphi Road to access the archery range located to the north of University Boulevard and west of Temple Street.

M-NCPPC agreed that impacts to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park would still be considered de minimis. We informed them that a letter would be sent to them in the near future for their concurrence.

### **3. Anacostia River Stream Valley Park**

As currently designed, 1.2 acres of land would be permanently used. Permanent impacts would result from the construction of the transitway parallel to and directly south of River Road through proposed project area. This is a very slight increase in the anticipated permanent impacts that were previously presented (1.22 acres).

The proposed project would result in 2.77 acres of temporary use of park in this area. This is a slight decrease from what was previously presented (2.9 acres). Temporary right-of-way impacts would result from the implementation of the staging area on currently undeveloped parcel at southeast quadrant of Haig Drive-River Road Intersection. This staging area is needed to construct the proposed transitway bridge adjacent to River Road. Upon completion of construction, this parcel of land would be completely cleared and graded for use as a futsal court to be constructed by M-NCPPC at a later date. Additional temporary impacts would result from grading, vegetation removal, and the reconstruction of the trail that parallels River Road.

Full access to park would be maintained during construction. Northeast Branch Trail would be temporarily detoured during construction to Haig Drive. The Northeast Branch Trail would be detoured to follow Haig Drive, where it would cross River Road at grade onto University Research Court and through University of Maryland property accessing an existing trail connection on the north side of River Road to reconnect to the existing trail.

No permanent impacts to existing park facilities are anticipated during construction. No change in access to the park would occur in this area during construction.

UMD is currently constructing a traffic circle at the intersection of River Road and University Research Court/Haig Road. As discussed with the University, the construction of the proposed Purple Line would require the removal of the traffic circle and the re-introduction of a signalized intersection. It is possible that the construction of the traffic circle would require some existing park land and any excess property outside of the Purple Line right-of-way would be conveyed back to the park once the circle was removed.

At the previous meeting, M-NCPPC requested the distance between the existing River Road Bridge and the proposed transitway bridge, where they cross over Northeast Branch Trail. There were concerns that if there was not sufficient distance between the two bridges, there could potentially be an impact to ambient lighting on the trail under the bridges. After the previous meeting it was determined that as currently designed, the distance between the existing and proposed bridges would be approximately 15 feet.

The proposed project would permanently use 1.20 acres (total park acreage is 794), which is 0.15% of the overall park. The proposed project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the park. The trail would be temporarily relocated during construction in an effort to remove the potential for pedestrian safety issues. Otherwise, no temporary or permanent impacts are expected to the existing park facilities. Full access would be maintained to the park at all times during and after the completion of construction. As currently designed, the proposed impacts to the park would meet the criteria for a de minimis impact finding, provided that M-NCPPC concurs. This information was relayed to M-NCPPC. Since a member of key M-NCPPC staff was absent, it was determined that they would take the information presented at the meeting and present it to him and would make the determination as to whether the park would meet de minimis impacts.

#### **4. Glenridge Community Park**

The Team presented the changes to the proposed yard and shop configuration since the previous meeting. As discussed with M-NCPPC, the Modified Linear Alignment was identified as the Preferred Alternative. Some retaining walls were added to the proposed alignment in an effort to reduce potential impacts to parks, streams, and woodland buffer located along the proposed boundaries of the facility. In an effort to further reduce impacts to parks and natural resources, a parking structure is proposed. Right of way impacts to the park would be both temporary and permanent. As currently designed, the proposed project would temporarily impact 0.56 acre and permanently impact 7.24 acres of land within Glenridge Community Park. In addition, 2.67 acres of land currently used as Northern Area Maintenance Office would be converted to parkland. While permanent impacts would increase from what was previously presented (6.33 acres), there would be an increase in reclaimed parkland (from 1.03 acre) that would offset the increase.

No temporary or permanent impacts to the existing park facilities are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Full access would be maintained to the park at all times during and after the completion of construction. While the proposed project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the park, M-NCPPC could not commit to a de minimis impact finding.

#### **5. West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Recreation Center**

As was discussed in the previous meeting with M-NCPPC, the proposed project would require 0.13 acres of temporary right-of-way from the park to reconstruct an existing stormdrain that drains into Beaverdam Creek. Full access to the park would be maintained during and after construction and none of the existing park facilities

would be affected during the construction of the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project would be subject to a temporary occupancy determination. As part of our agency coordination, it was relayed that we expect the concurrence letter for the temporary occupancy determination to be sent to M-NCPPC in the near future.

## **6. Potential Mitigation Measures**

We initiated a discussion of potential mitigation measures for park impacts. The total acreage of anticipated park impacts are 9.61 acres of permanent impacts and 14.77 acres of temporary impacts county-wide. The proposed replacement parkland within Glenridge Community Park (2.67 acres) would bring the total number of anticipated impacts to parklands within Prince George's County down to 6.94 acres.

Potential mitigation measures previously discussed with M-NCPPC included upgrading the second athletic field within Glenridge Elementary School and potentially fixing the existing drainage issues; grading the proposed staging area at the southeast quadrant of Haig Drive-River Road intersection for use as a futsal court; the construction of pedestrian bridges, including one from neighborhoods to the fields with Anacostia River Stream Valley Park and one over the Anacostia River to Northeast Branch Trail, south of River Road; and add park amenities around the existing stormwater management pond directly south of River Road, including benches and possibly a trail. We asked for their input on potential replacement parkland, providing improvements to existing parks as mitigation, and potential areas that could be used as parkland, but adding conservation easements in an effort to mitigate potential tree loss.

## **7. Next Meeting**

The next steps include obtaining concurrence from M-NCPPC with de minimis impacts and continued discussions regarding potential mitigation measures.

### ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

Task #	Action Item	Due Date	Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REGION III  
Delaware, District of  
Columbia, Maryland,  
Pennsylvania, Virginia,  
West Virginia

1760 Market Street  
Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4124  
215-656-7100  
215-656-7260 (fax)

December 8, 2011

Ms. Eileen Nivera, Planner-Coordinator  
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation  
6600 Kenilworth Avenue, Suite 301  
Riverdale, Maryland 20737

Subject: Purple Line, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties  
Section 4(f) Resources – Prince George's County Parks

Dear Ms. Nivera:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), is preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Purple Line transit project located in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland. The purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission to begin formal coordination regarding the Purple Line project and its potential effects on parks and properties within its jurisdiction.

The Purple Line would extend 16 miles, from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton, in Prince George's County. The Purple Line would connect Metrorail's Red Line (Bethesda and Silver Spring stations), Green Line (College Park station), and Orange Line (New Carrollton station). This project would provide transit options to people along the corridor, support economic development, and help address the region's air quality issues.

The attached map shows the proposed alignment, as well as park resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. As currently designed, the proposed project could potentially affect numerous resources along the proposed alignment. They are as follows:

- Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park- including Adelphi Manor Community Recreation Center, Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center, University Hills Neighborhood Park, and Northwest Branch Trail
- Paint Branch Stream Valley Park and Paint Branch Trail
- Anacostia River Stream Valley Park and Anacostia Tributary Trail System
- Glenridge Community Park/Northern Area Maintenance Office
- West Lanham Hills Neighborhood Recreation Center

As part of the coordination effort, we would like to request any relevant, available information on the identified parks, such as park and trail master plans, and funding information that might be beneficial with regard to our research of these resources.

Please contact Tim Lidiak, FTA Environmental Planner (215-656-7084) or John Newton, MTA's Environmental Manager (410-767-3769) at your convenience to schedule the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance with this process.

Sincerely,



Michele Destra, Director  
Office of Planning & Program Development

Enclosure

cc: Mike Madden, MTA  
John Newton, MTA  
Leslie Roche, PMC  
Steve Hawtof, GEC  
Amanda Baxter, GEC



## PURPLE LINE MEETING RECORD

**Organization:** National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)

**Meeting Date/Time:** Thursday, June 9, 2011 – 10:30 am

**Location:** NCPC Conference Room  
Washington, DC

**Attendance:** 6 people, including:

- Michael Weil (NCPC)
- Shane Dettman (NCPC)
- Amy Tarce (NCPC)

**Staffing:**

- Steve Hawtof, Purple Line Team
- Amanda Baxter, Purple Line Team
- Harriet Levine, Purple Line Team

**Meeting Summary:** The Purple Line GEC environmental team held a Project Overview meeting to the planning staff of the NCPC. The essence of the meeting was to: introduce the project team and the organization of the staffing and roles of the team including denoting the roles of the GEC, PMC and MTA; review and walk through the LPA; review the potential environmental effects denoted in the DEIS; talk about the projects next steps and how the Purple Line Team will include NCPC in the review process; and talk in general about the schedule for the FEIS, ROD and project

### Meeting Notes:

- Steve Hawtof opened up the meeting and explained in general the overall scope of the project and how we wanted to work with NCPC in the areas where they have reviewing authority such as Capper-Crampton Parks and where they had an advisory role such as with National Park Service (NPS) properties.
- Harriet Levine gave a detailed briefing of the LPA describing the rationale used in many critical areas along the 16 mile alignment. She described the intermodal connections to the WMATA facilities, the areas where the Light Rail would be on its own alignment and areas where it would be within existing roadways.
- Amy Tarce indicated that she was the primary author of the January 2009 NCPC letter that offered comments on the DEIS. Some of the comments would no longer apply since they were in areas where alignments were dropped. The Purple Line Team (PLT) also indicated that some of the comments were beyond the stage in planning and would be addressed in future stages of the project. The PLT indicated that as a follow up, a letter would be prepared to address the comment letter.
- Mike Weil explained that early and often coordination with them would help with the review process. The PLT indicated that once engineering was developed in



- greater detail, such as at Rock Creek Park, the PLT would then come back to NCPC to present this and the other areas where they have review authority.
- The PLT reviewed the environmental document schedule, indicating that presently the schedule for receiving the Record of Decision was the spring of 2013
  - Shane Dettman addressed their review process and indicated that it generally has 2 parts, a Preliminary Report and a Final Report. The staff will review and offer comments and will ultimately report to their commissioners. Shane indicated that in some cases, the Preliminary and Final Reports and approval can be combined.
  - Shane Dettman indicated that they were not a cooperating agency on this project and he would need to confirm what authority they had on Parks
  - Shane Dettman indicated that NCPC will adopt the FEIS and ROD once approved by FTA
- 
- **Follow-Up Items**
  - Shane Dettman will get us a list of National Park Service contacts
  - Shane Dettmer will prepare a fact sheet of their review process
  - NCPC will research Capper Crampton Parks within LPA and provide our team with a list of properties
  - PLT will prepare a response to the January 2009 NCPC DEIS comment letter
  - Once areas such as Rock Creek Park are ready, PLT will come back to NCPC for working meetings

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) Coordination Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 2/22/2012

**MEETING LOCATION:** NCPC Offices, 401 9th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20004

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Amanda J. Baxter

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** February 24, 2012

**DCN:** TBC

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

Coordination of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) with NCPC staff. Overview of NCPC Consultation Process.

### Discussion

1. FTA (Adam Stephenson and Tim Lidiak) describe FTA's role in the NEPA and Preliminary Engineering Process.
2. Purple Line Structural Lead, Jim Guinther, and Rock Creek Park Transit and Pedestrian Bridge Architectural Lead, Eric Birkhauser, present the Contextual, Schematics, and Conceptual Design of the bridge in Rock Creek Park. Jim discusses coordination with Montgomery County and Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). Mont. Co council approved a connection between the Rock Creek Park trail (at the base of the bridge) and the Capital Crescent Trail (parallel to the LPA)
  - NCPC staff indicated that they would like to see a structure "light" in appearance.
3. Purple Line team gave NCPC staff an overview of the Section 4(f) process. Discussed historic status vs. park status under 4(f).
  - ACTION: Need to determine if both M-NCPPC and NCPC need to concur on de minimus, if applicable.
4. NCPC discussed Capper Crampton Act: Congress provided NCPC with Capital to acquire lands that ultimately were handed off to M-NCPPC for jurisdiction; however, modification to park plans require NCPC approval.
  - ACTION: NCPC to provide Purple Line team with detailed listing of modifications to parks that have been approved.
5. NCPC discusses Approval vs. Advisory roles. Advisory outside of District, unless Capper Crampton funding was used then it requires Approval (formal Commission Action). NCPC has interest in four parks, all four having Capper Crampton funding; therefore, requiring formal Commission Action/Approval. (Sligo, Rock Creek, Anacostia, and Northwest Branch).
  - Impacts as a result of the Purple Line are not expected to alter the use of any of the parks listed above with the exception of Rock Creek Park in which we will introduce the Light Rail element in conjunction with the pedestrian bridge.
6. NCPC discuss the review process: Conceptual, Preliminary and Final. The following timeframes were discussed and agreed upon:

- Conceptual: Fall 2012-submission of Draft FEIS for public comments. At that time Purple Line will present project to Commission and staff comments will be issued. NCPC 30-day review
  - Preliminary: Spring 2013-issuance of Record of Decision (ROD), NCPC Commission will issue a formal report.
  - Final: 2014-greater than 75% design, NCPC will adopt NEPA document/ROD
7. Section 106 was discussed. NCPC has already been formally requested as a Consulting Party under Section 106. NCPC will seek signatory status to any Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) prepared for the project.
- ACTION: NCPC would like request Cooperating Agency status-FTA to prepare letter.
  - ACTION: Purple Line Cultural Resource Lead (John Martin) and NCPC Cultural Resource Lead (Jennifer Hirsch) to discuss Section 106 and set up Consulting Party meeting once effects have been determined.

The next meeting will be held on **TBD**

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Need to determine if both M-NCPPC and NCPC need to concur on de minimus, if applicable	FTA Legal	March 2012	
2.	NCPC to provide Purple Line team with detailed listing of modifications to parks that have been approved.	NCPC	March 2012	
3.	NCPC would like request Cooperating Agency status-FTA to prepare letter.	FTA	March 2012	
4.	Purple Line Cultural Resource Lead (John Martin) and NCPC Cultural Resource Lead (Jennifer Hirsch) to discuss Section 106 and set up Consulting Party meeting once effects have been determined.	John Martin	March 2012	
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				

*These minutes reflect the author's understanding of the discussions at the meeting. The minutes shall initially be considered as draft and open to comments for a period of 5 business days after the date of initial issuance. If no comments are received within five days, these minutes shall be considered final and will be issued as such within 2 business days of the initial comment period. (Remove this note from final version of the meeting minutes)*

### Attachments:

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)  
Agenda  
Previous meeting minutes  
Meeting Handouts

### Distribution:

Attendees  
PL GEC Core Team  
PL DCT (e-mail address to be provided by J. Boyer)







U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REGION III  
Delaware, District of  
Columbia, Maryland,  
Pennsylvania, Virginia,  
West Virginia

1760 Market Street  
Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4124  
215-656-7100  
215-656-7260 (fax)

December 8, 2011

Mr. Michael Weil  
National Capital Planning Commission  
Physical Planning  
401 9th Street NW  
North Lobby, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20004

Subject: Purple Line, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties  
Section 4(f) Resources – Montgomery and Prince George's County Parks

Dear Mr. Weil:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), is preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Purple Line transit project located in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland. The purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with the National Capital Planning Commission to begin formal coordination regarding the Purple Line project and its potential effects on parks and properties within its jurisdiction.

The Purple Line would extend 16 miles, from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton, in Prince George's County. The Purple Line would connect Metrorail's Red Line (Bethesda and Silver Spring stations), Green Line (College Park station), and Orange Line (New Carrollton station). This project would provide transit options to people along the corridor, support economic development, and help address the region's air quality issues.

The attached map shows the proposed alignment, as well as park resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. As currently designed, the proposed project could potentially affect numerous park resources along the proposed alignment that were purchased using Capper-Crampton Act funding. They are as follows:

- Rock Creek Park
- Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park
- Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park- including Adelphi Manor Community Recreation Center, Lane Manor Community Recreation and Aquatic Center, University Hills Neighborhood Park, and Northwest Branch Trail
- Anacostia River Stream Valley Park



As part of the coordination, we would like to request any relevant, available information on the identified parks, such as park and trail master plans, and funding information that might be beneficial with regard to our research of these resources.

Please contact Tim Lidiak, FTA Environmental Planner (215-656-7084) or John Newton, MTA's Environmental Manager (410-767-3769) at your convenience to schedule the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance with this process.

Sincerely,



Michele Destra, Director  
Office of Planning & Program Development

Enclosure

cc: Mike Madden, MTA  
John Newton, MTA  
Leslie Roche, PMC  
Steve Hawtof, GEC  
Amanda Baxter, GEC

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Park Service Project Information Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 3/30/2012

**MEETING LOCATION:** National Capital Parks – East, 1900 Anacostia Drive, Washington, DC

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Tobi Louise Kester

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** 4/18/2012

**DCN:** 2012.03.30.PM.PE.02.NPS Project Info. Mtg. 4-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), National Parks Service (NPS), and Purple Line team (PL) met to discuss a) single track design and b) engineering design and construction alternatives for the proposed bridge at the interchange of Baltimore-Washington (B-W) Parkway (MD 295) and Riverdale Road (MD 410), part of the Purple Line's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) through NPS property.

### Discussion

1. After introductions, PL presented the agenda and meeting goals. See attached pdf of presentation for details of information presented.
2. PL presented an overview of single track versus double track alignments (refer to slide 6 of presentation). Details included:
  1. Because of the need for a tangent section at the approach to the station platform MD 410 would need to be re-aligned to the northwest in the area of 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  2. Trains would have to cross EB 410 lanes twice in order to be in the median under the bridge – existing bridge is only high enough at its center for the train to pass under.
3. The single track scenario is “shared space,” where tracks run in same area as cars through the interchange, but at different times, rather than “shared use” where cars and trains operate together. The temporal separation is necessary because of the need for the trains to cross the traffic lanes.
4. NPS asked how many intersection traffic signals would need to be synchronized in the immediate vicinity of the interchange.
5. PL indicated that 4 signals are directly impacted in the single track alignment option. PL discussed the requirements for safe movement of all vehicles and people through the interchange, related to the single track alignment option. Details included:
  - It would take 35 seconds to clear the space before the train could enter the area.
  - Trains would take 45 seconds to pass from one end of single track segment to the other – a total length of 1,600 feet.
  - Typical train cycle at peak travel times (3 hours in am and 3 hours in pm), for LPA is 1 train every 6 minutes in each direction, so 1 train would pass through the interchange area every 3 minutes.

- The signal cycle length would need to be increased to 220 seconds if single track option were implemented.
  - Since the goal for traffic operations would be to not back traffic up on the Parkway, EB traffic would back up for approximately 4,000 feet prior to interchange under the single track scenario, as opposed to 1,100 feet under the LPA option (beyond Kenilworth Avenue).
6. PL concluded that the single track option is not a viable alternative due to the delays and traffic implications.
  7. NPS asked what traffic delays to both EB and WB traffic resulted from the double track (LPA) option.
  8. PL indicated some delays would result, but LPA delays are more manageable – PL will verify information for next meeting.
  9. PL will provide cross-sections at and around the station at the next meeting.
  10. NPS questioned impacts of swm and drainage at the station.
  11. PL said that NPS had already indicated no known drainage issues in the area, and PL anticipates no drainage or swm issues would result from the proposed station.
  12. NPS expressed concern regarding grading in the area of the proposed station, especially as it relates to sidewalks.
  13. NPS asked if any of the intersections in the vicinity of the B-W Parkway would be upgraded.
  14. PL indicated that the intersection of MD 410 and 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be redesigned and upgraded. Also, where left turn movements in the interchange area require restriping, etc, the PL project would include such work.
  15. PL recapped what has occurred to date for the project relating to the NPS:
    - At the first meeting (2-1-12), PL provided an introduction to NPS of the entire project
    - At the second meeting (2-28-12), the tunnel option was presented and determined by PL, with agreement from NPS, as an option not suitable for further discussion, review, or design. Therefore, the tunnel option has been dismissed. NPS concurred.
    - At today's meeting (3-30-12), PL presented the single track option, which has been determined to be not suitable for further discussion, review, or design. Therefore, the single track option has been dismissed. NPS concurred.
  16. NPS requested clarification regarding how these options would be included in the NEPA documents as considered and dismissed.
  17. PL reviewed the NEPA process noting that the tunnel option would be written as it relates to an effort to avoid 4(f) properties and environmental resources in the project area. The single track option would be written as it relates to minimization of impacts to 4(f) and environmental resources.
  18. PL– discussed Streamlining NEPA analysis and added that this topic will be discussed further in future monthly meetings.
  19. PL noted that the efforts related to NPS property were a direct response to the interaction with the NPS agency, and should be reflected as such in documentation.
  20. PL directed discussion to the LPA and specifically the options concerning the proposed B-W Parkway bridge reconstruction over MD 410. A view of existing conditions was presented (see slide 8 of attached presentation).

21. PL presented a photo-rendering of the proposed bridge over MD 410, from the viewpoint of looking EB on MD 410, with the bridge lengthened to accommodate the double track LPA of the PL to the right side of the rendering.
22. NPS noted that the house currently existing on the right hand corner of the interchange (right side of the previous slide) was gone.
23. PL confirmed that the house in question was identified as a displacement in all scenarios being considered for the interchange improvements.
24. Pages 8 and 9 of attached presentation showing proposed bridge designs were described by PL. The flat bottom of the first bridge beam would allow for adequate height for trains and catenary lines to pass underneath, while not requiring a pier between MD 410 and the proposed tracks for the PL. The second image showed arched bridge beams, more reflective of the current bridge design, but would require a pier to be built between MD 410 and the PL tracks. The pier as shown consists of columns.
25. PL to confirm size requirements of piers for the arched option and report back at next meeting.
26. NPS noted the location of the proposed sidewalk.
27. PL indicated the final location of the sidewalk could be reconsidered as design moves forward.
28. NPS expressed concern regarding pedestrian safety while crossing the intersection, especially crossing tracks.
29. PL indicated the design as shown is typical of similar conditions currently in place across the region.
30. NPS asked if the location of the north abutment would be the same in either option, or if there was a difference in location depending on which bridge design was selected.
31. PL to verify that location of the northern abutment in each scenario.
32. NPS asked if the arch in the middle of the beam in the second option was the same as the arch in the existing bridge.
33. PL will provide more exact design measurements and detail as design progresses, but indicated the arch was intended to be as close to existing conditions as possible for the arch over the roadway of MD 410. However, the arch over the PL tracks is probably not going to be quite the same because of the proportions of the arch and beam length, and the need to make allowance for catenary lines under the arch.
34. NPS asked where the poles for the catenary line would be located, and what spacing could be achieved, with the hope that the poles would be as inconspicuous as possible in the interchange area.
35. PL responded that poles could be a maximum of 200 feet on center, however, curves and other factors must also be taken into account. Curves typically result in closer spacing of poles. However, exact pole locations are still under consideration and will be presented in future meetings. PL indicated the distance between the SB and NB bridge spans is over the maximum 200 feet allowed between poles.
36. NPS reiterated their desire for the design to be considerate of aesthetics. NPS asked if wires could be attached to the underside of the bridge structure, and whether a pole was absolutely required between the NB and SB B-W Parkway bridge spans.
37. PL indicated that conditions exist today where catenary lines are attached to bridges, specifically in the Baltimore region.

38. PL will provide, at the next meeting, images of existing conditions where catenary lines are attached to the underside of bridges, and will provide information regarding impacts of attaching catenary lines to bridges on long-term maintenance and systems controls.
39. NPS asked if the Federal government has ever allowed such lines to be attached to bridges for which it is responsible for maintenance and control.
40. PL to check on Federal government rules and examples, if any.
41. NPS indicated that Charles Borders would be a good contact at EFL, is the recognized NPS Liaison for projects such as PL.
42. NPS asked if, assuming a pole is required between the two bridge spans, the pole could be centered between the bridge spans and the 200 feet to the next pole would start at this central pole in either direction. NPS also asked for details regarding poles and arms.
43. PL to provide, at the next meeting, pole and arm details including:
  - Finishes
  - Locations
  - Standards for design
  - Special design options
  - Colors
44. NPS indicated that they would need to take the options to others before a final decision could be made as to the flat or arched design style of beam. Of note would be how the design could be kept to historical standards.
45. PL reiterated that the stone from the existing bridge abutments would be reused in the final design. Essentially the location of the bridge abutments to be reconstructed would be shifted further north.
46. PL to provide NPS with acreage of impacts at the abutments, noting differences in acreage impacts between bridge style options, if any.
47. NPS noted that the PL design team should be using the Design Standards for the B-W Parkway, especially relating to stone and other finishes, and details of the arch under the bridge, if it is replicated.
48. PL confirmed that the PL Team has a copy of the B-W Parkway Design Standards. PL will ensure the Design Standards are available to everyone on the team.
49. PL moved discussion to the construction of proposed bridges. PL indicated that the views before and after construction from the B-W Parkway will appear very similar for people in vehicles driving on the Parkway. Therefore, the critical elements to consider in each Maintenance of Traffic Alternative are:
  - Views from along the Parkway during construction,
  - Views from MD 410 during construction,
  - Final size of bridges related to proposed road and shoulder widths and impacts to existing resources,
  - Construction schedules, and
  - Safety issues during construction.
50. Four Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives (Alternatives) were presented (slide 12 of attached presentation.)
51. PL noted that the new Alternatives were generated in response to NPS concerns.
52. PL explained that Alternative 1 (one temporary bridge in the median) was dismissed previously because of potentially significant impacts to resources.

53. PL described Alternative 2 (two temporary bridges built directly adjacent to the existing bridges in the inside)– more impacts would occur if no retaining walls used, so an option with retaining walls has also been developed.
54. NPS requested clarification of construction sequencing if retaining walls were included.
55. PL verified that retaining walls would be built first, followed by construction of temporary bridges, and finally construction of final bridges.
56. PL presented Alternative 3 (temporary bridges built adjacent to the exiting bridges on the outside) which is an option with all widening for MOT toward the existing ramps.
57. NPS asked whose land was being built on in Alternative 3.
58. PL confirmed the land between the Parkway and the ramps is NPS land.
59. NPS asked if any impacts would be made to ramps themselves.
60. PL verified that no impacts to ramps would occur.
61. NPS asked if there would be any impacts to traffic on ramps during construction.
62. PL indicated that by using a small wall, no impacts to ramp traffic during construction would result.
63. PL presented Alternative 4, (widening the existing bridges) noting that the roadway would need to be 52' to accommodate the MOT for the 3 phases of construction. Alternatives 2 and 3 would require a 40'-wide structure. NPS noted that Alternate 4 seemed least friendly to traffic, and is the most dangerous from a construction perspective.
64. PL stated that a design speed of 60 mph was built into the design and maintenance of traffic for this option, but a slowing of traffic as a result of vehicles entering a construction zone could still be expected.
65. NPS asked what the duration of construction would be for each Alternative presented.
66. PL distributed a Draft Bridge Reconstruction – Impact Matrix (see attachment), which defines the following construction durations:
  - Alternative 2 without walls 20 months
  - Alternative 2 with walls 23 months
  - Alternative 3 23 months
  - Alternative 4 without walls 26 months
  - Alternative 4 with walls 29 months
67. NPS requested PL to summarize the costs, constraints, and benefits from the chart.
68. PL noted the Costs, Pros, and Cons listed in the table
69. PL is looking for feedback from NPS on the different Alternatives.
70. PL noted that even though Alternative 4 does not include the use of temporary bridges, the northern abutment of the existing structure would need to be reconstructed, in order to effectively accommodate the different lane and shoulder widths that would result from Alternative 4 construction.
71. PL also noted that Alternative 4 would likely result in lanes closures at night and/or on weekends.
72. NPS expressed concern that there were just too many Alternatives and asked if there was any way to reduce the options based on technical requirements and practical implications of the Alternatives.
73. NPS asked what the overall impact was of using or not using walls.



74. PL explained that walls were used to minimize impacts to existing resources, but that they also resulted in a longer temporary impact to the project area because of the construction time associated with the walls.
75. PL suggested that because walls would result in less impacts, some of the Alternatives without walls could be eliminated from the list. After some discussion it was decided that the following four alternatives would be retained for consideration:
  - a. Alternative 2 with walls
  - b. Alternative 3
  - c. Alternatives 4 widened on the outside (towards the ramps) without retaining walls
  - d. Alternatives 4 widened on the inside (toward the median) with retaining walls
76. NPS asked for verification that the impacts shown on each presentation slide were accurate as they relate to LOD for the project.
77. PL verified that what is included in presentation is accurate, reiterating that walls would be built from behind in order to reduce potential impacts. The construction sequencing would be to build the wall from behind, then build temporary bridges, then work on existing Parkway structures once traffic has been diverted onto temporary bridges.
78. NPS asked if PL could live with any of the alternative presented, regardless of stated cost differences.
79. PL indicated that each Alternative presented was a viable option and would be acceptable so long as final engineering proved the option feasible. All indications so far are conducive to all options as presented being feasible.
80. NPS asked for clarification regarding the effect of construction on traffic speed, by Alternative.
81. PL stated that Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in relatively little slowing of traffic, except that people generally slow down in a construction zone. Alternative 4 would have moderate impacts (the highest of all Alternatives), since the travelling public is much closer in proximity to actual construction. The effect of driving through construction, as would be the case in Alternative 4, is much different than driving past construction, the condition of Alternatives 2 and 3.
82. PL stated that no significant traffic delays are anticipated with any of the Alternatives.
83. NPS suggested the duration of construction may be one of the more significant deciding factors in deciding which Alternative they would prefer.
84. PL indicated they were hopeful that enough information had been presented to allow NPS to consider everything and have feedback for PL by the next meeting. PL also reiterated that if any additional information was required in order to assist in the decision-making process, upon request such information would be generated by PL and passed along to NPS in a timely manner.
85. PL asked if NPS was comfortable scheduling monthly meetings.
86. NPS indicated a monthly schedule was acceptable and would be set up, with PL coordinating.
87. PL noted that NPS is now considered an official "Coordinating Agency" and PL would be sure to coordinate the NEPA documentation currently being assembled with NPS efforts.
88. PL anticipates Mitigation of impacts will be the focus of meetings once a bridge construction Alternative has been selected.



89. NPS noted that meetings with multiple agencies in attendance can be cumbersome.
90. PL and NPS discussed the different meetings that NPS and PL currently use for review and general information dissemination, including IRM.
91. NPS stated a preference for having fewer agencies and more detailed review of topic items in meetings than would be typical in large interagency review meetings.
92. PL suggested that the IRM meeting would be the last step in the review meeting process. The PL team wants to ensure no one will be surprised by anything that ends up in the NEPA document or on project plans.
93. NPS asked for clarification on how the 4(f) status of the property in question affects the NEPA process and documentation.
94. PL indicated that the B-W Parkway property has 2 different designations within the NEPA document – both the 4(f) status and a Historic (106) status.
95. NPS indicated that the 4(f) status specifically means there are multiple ways the project can be reviewed, internal to NPS, including through ER 2000.
96. PL indicated that it has been difficult thus far for the PL to get information on the ER 2000 process.
97. FTA concurred with PL regarding the difficulty everyone is having finding out about the ER 2000 process.
98. NPS said they will provide assistance and details regarding who initiates forms and application processing and that generally NPS sends 4(f) documentation to ER 2000 which goes to CEQ.
99. PL and NPS agreed that a formal, written pathway forward for the project document processing is needed.
100. PL reminded everyone that the PL has an established project schedule that must be taken into account for all future scheduling purposes. At the next meeting, PL will provide an overview of the next few project milestone meetings and schedule items for everyone's consideration.
101. NPS requested that all future meeting presentations by PL include a slide showing a schedule of the project .
102. NPS provided FTA with a contact for project processing through Federal government.
103. NPS requested a clarification from PL regarding total project impacts on the B-W Parkway land.
104. NPS provided the contact name of Brian Woodbury – Chief of Lands ([brianwoodbury@nps.gov](mailto:brianwoodbury@nps.gov)) for issues relating to Federal right-of-ways. NPS requested that all decisions made at meetings be pulled out separately in the meeting minutes, for general clarification and administrative documentation purposes.
105. PL will include a table of Decisions Made in Meeting Minutes.

The next meeting will be held on 4/27/2012

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Confirm size requirements of piers for the arched beam option over MD 410.	PL	4/27	
2.	Confirm size requirements of piers for the arched beam option over MD 410.	PL	4/27	
3.	Verify location of northern abutment in each beam option (arched vs. flat) over MD 410.	PL	4/27	
4.	Provide more detailed design of arched beams over MD 410 if arched beam option is selected.	PL	Summer	
5.	Provide images and details of existing conditions where catenary lines are attached to underside of bridges.	PL	4/27	
6.	Provide information regarding impacts of attaching catenary lines to bridges on long-term maintenance and control systems.	PL	4/27	
7.	Provide Federal government regulations for attaching catenary lines to "Federal" bridges, and examples, if available.	PL	4/27	
8.	Provide catenary pole and arm details related to finishes, locations, standards for design, special design options, and colors.	PL	4/27	
9.	Ensure B-W Parkway Design Standards are posted on ProjectWise for use by entire design Team.	PL	4/27	
10.	Provide feedback on Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives.	NPS	4/27	
11.	Provide assistance and details regarding application and processing of 4(f) documentation through ER 2000.	NPS	4/27	
12.	Establish formal, written procedure regarding 4(f) document application and processing.	PL	5/25	
13.	Provide overview of next 2-3 project milestone meetings and schedule items.	PL	4/27	
14.	Provide slide showing schedule of upcoming meetings (and other important project events, if any.)	PL	4/27	
15.	Provide total project impacts to B-W Parkway land.	PL	4/27	

16.	Call out all decisions made during each meeting in separate table in meeting minutes. (For every meeting forthwith.)	PL		
-----	--	----	--	--

#### SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE

Decision #	Description	Decision Date	Concurring Agency/Party
1.	Tunnel option dismissed.	3-30-12	NPS
2.	Single track option under MD 410 dismissed.	3-30-12	NPS
3.	Maintenance of Traffic Alternative 1 dismissed.	3-30-12	NPS
4.	Monthly meeting schedule should be established.	3-30-12	NPS
5.	Formal procedure for project 4(f) document processing and review should be established.	3-30-12	NPS, FTA

*These minutes reflect the author's understanding of the discussions at the meeting. The minutes shall initially be considered as draft and open to comments for a period of 5 business days after the date of initial issuance. If no comments are received within five days, these minutes shall be considered final and will be issued as such within 2 business days of the initial comment period. (Remove this note from final version of the meeting minutes)*

#### Attachments:

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)  
Agenda  
Previous meeting minutes  
Meeting Handouts

#### Distribution:

Attendees  
PL GEC Core Team  
PL DCT (PLdocumentcontrol@gfnet.com)



**ATTENDANCE ROSTER**  
**Meeting Title**  
**Date 3/30/12 Time 10 AM**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Gopaul Noojibail	NPS- NACE	202-690-5160	Gopaul.noojibail@nps.gov
Stephen Syphax	NPS- NACE	202-690-5160	Stephen_syphax@nps.gov
David Hayes	NPS-NCR	202-619-7277	David_Hayes@nps.gov
Charles Murphy	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	cmurphy@gfnet.com
Charlie Bailey	P/L GEC	410-235-6001	cbailey@mahanrykiel.com
Tobi Louse Kester	P/L GEC	410-302-0598	tkester@cemscience.com
Amanda Baxter	P/L GEC	443-848-6096	abaxter@swrallp.com
Harriet Levine	P/L GEC	410-230-6630	Harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Adam Stephenson	FTA	202-366-5183	Adam.stephenson@dot.gov
Dan Koenig	FTA	202-219-3525	Daniel.koenig@dot.gov
Matt Storck	P/L GEC	410-281-2935	Matthew.storck@stvinc.com
Monica Meade	PL PMC	410-752-8635	meade@pbworld.com
Steve Hawtof	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Eric Harris	NPS- NACE-BWP	301-344-3948	Eric_harris@nps.gov
Fred Cunningham	NPS- NACE-BWP	301-344-3948	Fred_Cunningham@nps.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Park Service Pre-Initiation Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 2/1/2012

**MEETING LOCATION:** National Capital Parks- East Washington DC

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Steven Hawtof, Monica Meade, Dan Koenig

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** 2/13/12

**DCN:** 2012.02.10.PM.PE:3.2B.National Park Service Pre-Initiation Meeting 1-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

The FTA and the Purple Line Team Purple Line team was invited to an NPS internal meeting to give a brief overview of the Purple Line project to NCPE staff along with David Hayes of NCR.

### Discussion

1. NPS asked if there was a tunneling option considered during DEIS. Purple Line Team (PLT) responded that MTA investigated surface options on Riverdale Road (which would not have impacted the Parkway), and off the roadway to the south of Riverdale Road.
2. PLT indicated we will perform a concept level analysis of a tunnel option looking into pros and cons, costs, etc. which will be presented at the February 29, 2012 meeting with NPS
3. Gopaul indicated that NPS needs an official letter requesting them to be a cooperating agency. He also indicated that the Parkway could result in a Section 106 and 4(f) impact, which the PLT acknowledged. FTA will send a letter to NPS by Feb 17.
4. NPS questioned why they were just hearing about this project 3 years after the DEIS was approved. PLT indicated that outreach was performed with Susan Hinton and NPS responded in writing to the DEIS in 2009. David Hayes stated that he had Susan's files on the Purple Line.
5. NPS expressed concern that the decision on the alignment has already been made. Monica assured NPS that that the project has only just entered Preliminary Engineering and a preferred alignment decision will not be made until the Environmental Impact Statement is issued and a record of decision is finalized.
6. NPS requested that they do a full review of the alternatives prior to anything going to the public., as part of being a cooperating agency.
7. NPS asked if this would be a supplemental EIS and Dan (FTA) indicated that the decision on whether a Supplemental NEPA document would be necessary depending on the extent of the changes from the DEIS. This will be determined when we know what alignment options are going forward. It was acknowledged that a minimum re-evaluation will be required because three years has elapsed since issuance of the DEIS in Fall of 2008.
8. NPS asked if an economic analysis had been or would be performed to measure the loss of the park visitor's experience should they be delayed on the Parkway during construction. This type of analysis is not being prepared at this time.

9. Steve Hawtof indicated that the existing structure was lengthened in 1990 and if there were any experiences with that project to share. It was indicated that this piece of the parkway was under other management at that time. NPS indicated that they had bad experiences on the MD 197 structure construction at the parkway.
10. NPS is particularly concerned about forest, and tree impacts – “preservation of mature trees is critical”
11. NPS didn’t want to look at the surface option and accompanying maintenance of traffic on the parkway at this meeting; they want to wait to assess these options when the tunneling option is also presented.

The next meeting will be held on 2/28/2012

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Need formal letter to invite NPS to become a Cooperating Agency	PLT/FTA	2/10/12	
2.	Need formal letter to invite NPS as consulting party in the 106 process	PLT/FTA	2/10/12	
3.	NPS will respond to this letter identifying their role as a cooperating agency	NPS		
4.	MTA to look at a tunneling option as an alternative through the BW Parkway area. Add to the matrix in terms of cost, pros and cons so it can be compared to the surface running alignments	PLT/FTA	2/28/12	
5.	NPS wants to see a schedule for the document	PLT/FTA	2/28/12	
6.	FTA/MTA to hold a follow up meeting to show the alternatives and maintenance of traffic schemes. This meeting is tentatively set for February 28, 2012. Our team will bring the tunnel option analysis, renderings of what the park will look after construction paying attention to viewshed and park experience; matching stone veneer look and material; verify construction access from Riverdale Road, not the Parkway; estimate construction durations; show limits of disturbance; indicate construction staging areas; have landscape architect and archeologist attend the meeting; update the comparison matrix including for a tunneling alternative.	PLT/FTA/NPS	2/28/12	
7.				
8.				

### Attachments:

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)

### Distribution:

Attendees





PL GEC Core Team

PL DCT (e-mail address to be provided by J. Boyer)



**ATTENDANCE ROSTER**  
**Meeting Title- NPS Pre-initiation Meeting for Purple Line**  
**2/1/12 11:00 A.M.**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Monica Meade	Purple Line Team	410-752-9635	meade@pbworld.com
Steve Hawtof	Purple Line Team	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
David Hayes	NCR Transportation Liaison	202-619-2017	David_Hayes@nps.gov
Stephen Syphax	NPS- NCP-East	202-690-5160	Stephen_Syphax@nps.gov
James Rosenstock	NPS	202-690-5161	James_Rosenstock@nps.gov
Alex Romero	NPS/NACE	202-690-5197	Alex_Romero@nps.gov
Dan Koenig	FTA	202-219-3528	Daniel Koenig <daniel.koenig@dot.gov>
Tim Lidiak	FTA	215-656-7084	Tim Lidiak <timothy.lidiak@dot.gov>
Jay Fox	FTA	215-656-7084	Jay.fox@dot.gov
Fred Cunningham	District Manager, NPS	301-344-3948	Fred_Cunningham@nps.gov
Eric Harris	Acting Maintenance Supervisor, NPS	301-344-3948	Eric_Harris@nps.gov
Gopaul Noojibail	NPS/NACE	202-690-5197	Gopaul_Noojibail@nps.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Park Service Project Information Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 2/28/2012

**MEETING LOCATION:** National Capital Parks – East, 1900 Anacostia Drive, Washington, DC

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Tobi Louise Kester

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** March 20, 2012

**DCN:** 2012.02.28.PM.PE.02.NPS Project Info. Mtg. 2-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), National Parks Service (NPS), and Purple Line team (PL) met to discuss the proposed alignment of the Purple Line's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) through NPS property at the Baltimore-Washington (B-W) Parkway (MD 295), at the intersection of Riverdale Road (MD 410) and the B-W Parkway.

### Discussion

1. PL team members provided an overview of the reasoning behind the use of light rail for the Purple Line project, including its relative simplicity and flexibility in design for use in areas where multi-modal transportation occurs (transit, pedestrians, motorized vehicles). The use of dedicated lanes for the light rail line was explained. The expected ridership would be 60,000 daily riders and the number of cars taken off the road would be 20,000 daily. Light rail is most effective when built at grade, with stations in key activity centers or near denser residential areas. The Purple Line has stations about every  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile. Patrons will get to the Light rail on foot, or transferring from other transit services. The Metro connections are very important to the Purple Line as 30% of the riders will use Metro for part of their trip.
2. NPS asked if overhead wires were always utilized in conjunction with light rail, or if other options were available.
3. PL explained that other options are available and have been used elsewhere, particularly in Europe in historic districts, however the costs are high, the technology is proprietary, and there are questions about how well these technologies would work in this climate with snow and ice. The average spacing of poles to support the wires is approximately every 100 feet. The 3 typical options for light rail line alignments were reviewed – surface, tunnel, and aerial alignments. Given the high cost of tunnel and aerial alignments, they are generally only used to avoid areas of substantial traffic congestion, environmentally and culturally sensitive areas or where the physical topography precludes a surface alignment. The currently proposed PL alignment includes one tunnel section in Silver Spring where the grade on Wayne Avenue is outside the PL design criteria for light rail operations.
4. NPS emphasized the importance to consider the environmentally sensitive areas of the project.
5. A brief overview was given by PL of the steps previously taken to include the NPS service in the planning project.

6. The project schedule as currently defined was presented by PL, with an acknowledgement that the NPS will issue its own ROD based on a review of the FEIS. 2020 was highlighted as the end date whereon the Purple Line is expected to be fully operational.
7. PL presented a video of a drive through the project area, which was discussed both from the view of a vehicular passenger travelling on the B-W Parkway, and along the ramps to MD 410 and from MD 410 up to the B-W Parkway. It was noted that the B-W Parkway has a high point in the middle of the bridge crossing MD 410.
8. NPS requested clarity of detail regarding the exact location and placement of the proposed tracks, and details regarding traffic patterns and flow through the area if the rail lines were installed.
9. PL provided design details to explain the anticipated track locations and traffic conditions.
10. NPS highlighted the need for careful consideration of existing and proposed screening and landscaping.
11. PL reiterated the project's Need and Purpose, making reference to the NEPA process with emphasis on the stated purpose to serve the community, and how the decision-making process has occurred thus far, including the need to consider costs for the project as an important decision-making factor.
12. PL reviewed previous design options that were considered for the project but later removed from consideration, including aerial and tunnel options, and reasons for the previous decisions made. An aerial option following Brier Ditch, and crossing over the Parkway north of MD 410 was briefly considered but was dropped because of the high level of potential environmental impacts to the area and the visual impacts to the parkway. A tunnel from River Rd to Veterans Parkway had been considered, but was dropped because of the high cost, and because it did not serve the Town of Riverdale Park (an important goal for Prince George's County). The tunnel option would have included an underground station at Beacon Heights. The high cost of underground stations was a significant factor in the decision-making process.
13. NPS requested clarification of locations where tunnels were considered. PL defined specific locations.
14. PL focused discussion on to the currently proposed grade crossing of the rail line through the on and off ramps between MD 410 and B-W Parkway. PL noted that an alignment using shared lanes on Riverdale Road was one of the alternatives in the Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS). This would not have required the lengthening of the Parkway bridge over MD 410, but both traffic and light rail operations would have been very poor and would have resulted in delays and backups both on Riverdale Road, and on the Parkway exit ramps. Impacts to the B-W Parkway were discussed as PL described the currently proposed location of the rail lines on the south side of the LPA. The Light rail operations were discussed as well as the coordination of the signals at the ramps.
15. PL discussed the coordination of the traffic signal system with the timing of light rail trains. Considerations include: trains stopping for red lights, right-hand turns on red for vehicular traffic, and queuing for turns from off-ramps.
16. NPS noted that the MD 410/B-W Parkway interchange area currently gets quite congested, especially during peak hours. The PL traffic engineer provided further information regarding spacing of trains and anticipated flow of traffic through the interchange area. The size of proposed trains was discussed in some detail relating to where the trains might stop on red lights, and how much of the interchange would be blocked at any one time as the train passed through.
17. PL anticipates trains will run on 6 minute intervals during peak hours, so given that a train will be going in each direction on this timing cycle, a train will pass through the interchange every 3 minutes at peak travel times.

18. NPS reiterated concern regarding actual patterns of movement through the interchange area, including movement of pedestrians, motorized vehicles, and the trains. Particular concern was expressed regarding queuing onto the B-W Parkway as vehicles were exiting onto MD 410.
19. PL indicated that queuing on the B-W Parkway ramps was taken into account when the interchange was analyzed.
20. NPS expressed concern about future traffic, anticipating potential significant increases in volume, leading to more problematic congestion. The Purple Line traffic analysis is based on the year 2030.
21. PL discussed ways in which an improvement to traffic patterns beyond the B-W Parkway interchange area that would result from the project would also potentially improve the functioning of the interchange area.
22. NPS asked whether the recent Parkway Widening feasibility study had been included in the PL analysis. The PL team explained that only planned and programmed (i.e. funded) projects in the Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRTP) are included.
23. PL presented roll plans depicting a tunnel design through the MD 410/B-W Parkway interchange area. An evaluation of a shorter tunnel to avoid the Parkway had been requested at the NPS meeting on February 1, 2012. Specific details include:
  - Located south of MD 410, 60 feet from currently proposed LPA location because soil conditions do not permit the tunnel to be under the existing abutment
  - Significant depth required, due in part to existing soil conditions
  - Requires 3 additional residential displacements in the neighborhood west of interchange along MD 410
  - Requires the Beacon Heights station to be located underground
  - Requires 1 additional residential displacement on Veterans Parkway, just west of the intersection with Riverdale Road
  - Could not return to grade until Veteran's Parkway
  - Avoids B-W Parkway completely
  - Requires approximately 4,000 feet of tunnel and related structures
  - Anticipated costs of \$300 million, including approximately \$75 million for the underground station
  - Requires a pump to run constantly in order to keep water drainage systems functioning adequately
24. NPS questioned whether the possibility of running a single track through the interchange had been considered for the project, so that possibly the existing bridge would not need replacing.
25. PL indicated that the only way to run a track for the light rail line through the interchange without affecting the existing bridges over MD 410 was to locate the track in the center of the MD 410 median. PL also noted that a single track would have unacceptable impacts to light rail operations. PL described in some detail difficulties associated with taking a double track down to a single track and then back to a double track. In general, from the perspective of both operating the light rail and maintaining traffic within the interchange, it was not deemed practical or reasonable to have the light rail in the center of the median. PL team noted that there have been requests for single track sections elsewhere in the project, but that they have been rejected because of the operational impacts.
26. NPS asked if further studies could be done to provide more details.

27. PL described some of the previous studies already completed but agreed to provide more information on the challenges of operating single track segments.
28. NPS inquired as to details about moving the abutments.
29. PL provided details about the proposed design, and noted that the stone on the exterior of the existing bridge could be reused on the proposed bridge, and that the specific design of the girders and other design elements of the bridge would be decided with input from NPS.
30. NPS asked what the temporary impacts of the project would be – specifically if temporary bridges were to be used.
31. PL noted that an option is being considered for the project where through careful phasing of construction, no temporary bridges will be required or used. However, the studies on this option are not yet complete; therefore the validity of the option has not been determined.
32. Considerations in the no-temporary-bridge option are:
  - Sequencing of travel lane shifts
  - Longer construction period
  - Slightly wider final widths of the B-W Parkway and bridge (approx. 4 feet)
  - Lane width reductions through construction
33. NPS noted that despite being a Parkway, trucks do use the parkway to access Fort Meade. Proposed lane widths would need to accommodate them.
34. NPS asked about how close trees could be placed adjacent to the light rail line.
35. PL used Google Earth to provide aerial mapping in describing the project. PL stated that at the next meeting, a structural engineer would be present so that details of the bridge and other required structures associated with the project could be discussed.
36. NPS expressed concern regarding the historic nature of the bridge.
37. A Federal Transit Administration representative suggested that a series of renderings could be prepared to demonstrate potential growth of vegetation over time.
38. PL agreed and will provide renderings.
39. NPS noted that some of the early mapping for PL indicated there would be staging for construction of the PL on B-W Parkway land.
40. PL stated that the mapping was out of date and that staging for the project would occur outside the limits of B-W Parkway lands, on the site of the residential displacements.
41. PL discussed the potential for longer lasting impacts to some elements of the B-W Parkway because it involves landscaping that will take time to regenerate and grow to sizes currently seen through the project area. Even though some impacts are technically considered temporary, temporary takes on a different meaning with vegetation.
42. PL also discussed the potential for visual impacts to the B-W Parkway during construction.
43. PL Team discussed the additional infrastructure of light rail system including poles, types of overhead wires and whether the wires could be attached to the underside of the bridge structure.

44. NPS requested that an "Administrative Record" be prepared to document NPS coordination in the decision-making process related to the project. All decisions and agreements should be well documented. This will provide a convenient resource should there be changes in NPS or PL staff.
45. FTA indicated that an invitation to the NPS as a cooperating agency had been prepared and will be distributed in the near future.
46. PL indicated their interest in learning from NPS any lessons learned from other projects completed along the B-W Parkway.
47. PL noted that last week a meeting was held with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), and that schedules for NCPC and PL had been acknowledged by each group. PL suggested NPS and NCPC be invited to each other's meetings to allow for effective coordination of all parties. There was agreement by all parties.
48. NPS reiterated the need to recognize NPS as a separate entity from NCPC.
49. PL noted the current status of the B-W Parkway in the 106 process.
50. NPS returned to discussions regarding the catenary lines and specific details of the light rail system.
51. NPS asked if it was possible to have a single wire running above the rail line, rather than the 2 wires typically seen on light rail systems.
52. PL indicated that it is possible to have single wires, however, with single wires, more poles are required. Additional poles are also required when there is a curve in the alignment of the rail line.
53. PL indicated that a Phase I Archaeological study had been completed for the project area involving the MD 410/B-W Parkway interchange. A Phase II permit request is being prepared and will be submitted to NPS in the near future.
54. Schedules and project timeline were discussed. PL suggested bi-weekly meetings.
55. NPS noted that they have several projects currently happening and scheduling of meetings would have to take into account these other projects. Bi-weekly is too frequent. Every 3 or 4 weeks would be better.
56. PL noted that it is critical to obtain from Eastern Federal Lands the structural as-built plans for the existing bridges over MD 410. Without these plans further analysis of the no-temporary-bridge option cannot be completed. Therefore agenda items and timing for the next meeting may depend on when these plans are received by PL.
57. All parties were in general agreement to have standing meetings scheduled.
58. NPS emphasized the need to receive the agendas for the meeting prior to the meeting so that the appropriate personnel could be designated to attend the meetings.

The next meeting will be held on 3/30/2012

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Prepare a schedule of meetings – include Structural Engineer in next meeting	Purple Line	3/20/12	
2.	Set up PL-NPS Administrative Record	Purple Line	3/20/12	
3.	Obtain structural engineering as-builts for bridges over MD 410 and complete analysis for no-temporary-bridge option	Federal Transit Administration	3/20/12	
4.	Send out Agency Coordination Letter	Federal Transit Administration	3/20/12	
5.	Submit Phase II Archaeological Study Request	Purple Line	3/20/12	
6.	Provide information regarding single versus double tracking	Purple Line	3/20/12	
7.	Prepare renderings of vegetative growth over time	Purple Line	3/20/12	
8.				
9.				

### Attachments:

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)

### Distribution:

Attendees

PL GEC Core Team

PL DCT – PLDOCUMENTCONTROL@GFNET.COM



Kerri Barile

Purple Line/DoveTail CEG

540-899-9170

kbarile@  
dovetailorg.com



National Capital Parks-East  
1900 Anacostia Drive, SE  
Washington, DC 20020

Meeting: PURPLE LINE Date: 2/28/12

Name	Position/Agency	Phone #/email address
JIM ROSENSTOCK	NPS	202-690-5160 j.rosenstock@nps.gov
Stephen Syphax	NPS	202-690-5127 stephen.syphax@nps.gov
Alexey Romero	NPS-NACE Super-Intendant	alex-romero@nps.gov
Harriet Levine	MTA Purple Line Team	410-280-6630 harriet.levine@jacobus.com
Steven Hawtof	MTA Purple Line Team	443-348-2017 shawtof@afinet.com
Adam Stephenson	PTA HQ Environmental	202-366-5183 adam.stephenson@ptago.com
Dan Koerig	FTA DC Metro Office	202-219-3525 daniel.koerig@dot.gov
G. Nooj, et al	NACE	202-692-5127 gnooj@nps.gov
MATT STORCK	MTA PURPLE LINE TEAM	410-281-2925 mstork@jacobus.com
Eula Danice	NACE	202-692-6038 eula.danice@nps.gov
CHARLIE BAILEY	MTA PURPLE LINE TEAM	410-235-6001 cbailey@mahannyskiel.com
Major Horsey	NPS NACE-Gree	301-344-3948 Major-Horsey@nps.gov
Carlton Hart	NACE	202-482-7252 chart@nps.gov
Amanda Boxer	Purple Line MTA	443-848-6096 abaxter@wralph.com
Toni Louise Kester	Purple Line	410-371-3695 tkester@nps.gov



## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Park Service Project Information Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 4/27/2012 10:00 am

**MEETING LOCATION:** National Capital Parks – East, 1900 Anacostia Drive, Washington, DC

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Tobi Louise Kester

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** 5/25/2012

**DCN:** 2012.04.27.PM.PE.02.NPS Project Info. Mtg.5-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

The Federal Transit administration (FTA), National Parks Service (NPS), and Purple Line team (PL) met to discuss a) Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) alternatives, b) Baltimore-Washington Parkway (Parkway) proposed structures configuration, c) catenary options for the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), d) catenary shield protection, and e) moving the project through NEPA process.

### Discussion

1. After introductions and a review of agenda, MOT Alternative 2 with walls, which includes the use of temporary bridges and temporary walls built towards the median, was presented by PL – use of retaining walls to minimize impacts to existing vegetation in median.
2. PL presented MOT Alternative 3 widening towards ramps, with no impacts to median and possible 2' high temporary wall on the inside of the ramps.
3. As photo-simulation was presented showing proposed conditions, NPS noted that it would be good to have before and after photos for each view presented and from both NB and SB ramps, to ensure clarity of detail. PL concurred and will include in future presentations as appropriate.
4. NPS inquired about the possibility of just building entirely new structures where the temporary structures are proposed, rather than building temporary bridges, tearing down existing ones, then rebuilding permanent bridges.
5. PL noted that some alternatives were actually preserving the northern bridge abutments, which, if only completely new structures were built as the final condition, would end up having to be removed.
6. NPS also noted that with a shift in alignment, which would result if completely new bridges were built without using temporary bridges, would potentially significantly change the park patron's view of and experience in the park. PL concurred. NPS does not want to change the park patron's experience.
7. PL reviewed the process of decision-making that has resulted in the MOT Alternatives presented to date.
8. PL presented phasing of construction associated with MOT Alternative 4 - Permanent Widening towards ramps, using sections to provide detail of:
  1. Moving traffic towards the median while construction occurs on the outer side of bridge
  2. Splitting traffic to move around construction that occurs in the center of the bridge

3. Moving traffic towards the outside of the bridges as construction is completed on the median side of the bridges
9. NPS asked what the anticipated posted speed would be through the construction.
10. PL indicated that the expected design speed would be 55 mph, but that traffic tends to slow in construction zones, regardless of posted speeds, and reiterated from last meeting that the lanes would be 11' wide through the construction zone – reduced lane widths being another factor typically contributing to slower speeds of traffic through construction zones.
11. PL provided more details of MOT Alternative 4, including that removal and reconstruction of the northern abutments would be required to accommodate the final bridge width, which would be 12' wider in MOT Alt. 4 than in either MOT Alt. 2 or MOT Alt. 3. PL reiterated that the final bridge width of MOT Alt. 2 and MOT Alt. 3 is 40', while the final width of MOT Alt. 4 is 52'.
12. NPS asked if a lower speed could be posted.
13. PL confirmed that lower speeds could be posted, but the geometry of the road would be designed to accommodate a 55 mph posted speed.
14. NPS asked whether the 52' wide bridge lane striping would result in shoulders that conform to the current Parkway Guidelines.
15. PL indicated that the Parkway Guidelines would not be met with the final bridge being 52' wide.
16. NPS asked why the longest project duration was associated with MOT Alt. 4.
17. PL detailed the process of building walls first (to minimize impacts to existing vegetation etc. around bridge), which accounts for the extended construction.
18. NPS requested a photo simulation of the walls, to detail of what the park patron would see of the walls.
19. PL will provide details and photo sims and indicated the walls would be both relatively small and temporary.
20. PL noted that AASHTO, Parkway Design Guidelines, and Federal Lands standards would be utilized for the parkway.
21. NPS will discuss the MOT Alternatives internally and will respond to the PL team with a decision on a preferred Alternative by Wednesday, May, 2, 2012.
22. PL presented Bridge span options (structural configurations), reviewing the straight versus arched options, with either galvanized poles or brown finishes.
23. NPS prefers arched support beam. Final decision made by NPS.
24. PL indicated that separating beams between 2 arches (over main travel lane of MD 410 and proposed PL LRT tracks) may need a wall as part of the support, but one is not currently proposed. No rails are required.
25. NPS requested further detail and indicated a preference for "the less the better" in terms of added walls or other elements. NPS also requested designers not introduce any new building materials, if possible.
26. PL will provide more details as pre-TS&L design is developed for the selected structures/configuration.
27. NPS asked if lighting was proposed as a part of the design.
28. PL indicated that lighting has not been included so far, but it would depend on requirements, including safety, as design progressed. PL assured NPS that designers would collaborate with NPS on the design of any features where finishes and styles could be chosen.

29. PL presented options for catenary lines, highlighting the fact that if the lines are not attached to the underside of the bridge, 4 additional poles are required to provide support for the lines at the correct height to adequately accommodate trains passing under the bridge.
30. NPS asked if it was possible to attach the lines to bridges, and if so, are more details available at this time.
31. PL indicated that catenary lines are attached to bridges on other transit lines, and showed photographs of examples, demonstrating that it is possible. However, whether attaching to the bridge is possible in this case, depends on who owns and who maintains the bridges. Federal Lands will review the plans, but the question of ownership and maintenance remains an outstanding concern.
32. NPS stated a preference for attaching catenary lines to the bridge if possible. Noted as a Final Decision.
33. PL will continue to investigate and determine ownership of bridge and determine parties who would be involved in maintenance agreement.
34. NPS indicated that internal discussions are on-going as to ownership of structures in parklands. The State of Maryland may own and maintain the bridge. NPS will verify their information when any internal determination has been made.
35. PL presented information regarding catenary shields, which are required by electrical code whenever lines pass under structures, creating conditions where falling debris or dumping of items onto catenary lines is possible from above.
36. NPS asked if it mattered that no pedestrians are supposed to be along the Parkway over the bridge.
37. PL indicated that it was more a matter of general safety, irrespective of anticipated pedestrians, because emergency situations could arise where people are on the bridge, and the catenary lines are live, therefore posing a potential hazard to not only people in the immediate vicinity, but all along the rail line, if objects were to fall on the lines and cause current to jump beyond its designed parameters. PL indicated that the issue is still under review and the question of necessity will be raised again with reviewers etc.
38. Of the variety of examples shown, NPS indicated a preference for clear material, if possible, to minimize potential visual impact to bridge structure. NPS asked about possibly creating an awning type of structure, possible arching of roof structure, and potentially using something that would more narrowly shroud only the catenary lines themselves.
39. PL indicated that this discussion was to introduce the concept to NPS so that as design progresses, NPS can determine preferences. Photographs of other existing options, photo simulations of the project site with potential options, and manufacturing or product details of proposed materials will be provided as project design progresses.
40. PL also focused discussion on the area on the edge of the proposed bridge above the PL LRT tracks where a vertical barrier is required – where a rail is currently proposed. More details to come from PL as design progresses.
41. The NEPA process was discussed in detail by all parties in the meeting, specifically regarding the ER 2000 process, 4(f) resources, 6(f) resources, potential 'de minimus' findings, DEIS and FEIS write-ups, and the project ROD.
42. Although the NPS will be preparing their own ROD, separate from the project ROD, it has been determined that the PL team will prepare the written basis for the NPS ROD as the project ROD is being prepared.
43. The result of the NPS ROD is an additional 30 days review period.

44. Further discussion will occur regarding environmental justice, climate change/sustainability (carbon emissions), other qualitative analysis, and mitigation of impacts. Of particular concern is the impact to the parkland associated with the proposed permanent taking where MD 410 is being reconfigured to accommodate the proposed station to the east of the Parkway. Because this will be considered a permanent impact to a parkland involving permanent conversion from parkland to another unrelated use, a transfer in ownership and maintenance responsibilities, NPS indicated that the project will likely be determined to have 6(f) resources.
45. Both PL and NPS will investigate further the designation of 6(f) resources for further discussion purposes. Section 6(f) resources will be an agenda item at the next meeting.
46. The next 4 meeting dates were reviewed and confirmed as acceptable for all parties: May 25<sup>th</sup>, June 22<sup>nd</sup>, July 27, and August 24.

The next meeting will be held on 5/25/2012.

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Provide before and after photo simulations at NB and SB ramps showing MOT Alt. 3 and MOT Alt. 4 with walls.	PL	5/25	
2.	Provide PL with decision on preferred MOT Alternative by May 3, 2012.	NPS	5/14	
3.	Provide additional details of structures and configurations as pre-TS&L design progresses.	PL	Ongoing	
4.	Determine ownership of bridges and parties involved in maintenance agreements.	PL	5/25	
5.	Verify internal determinations of ownership and maintenance on bridges.	NPS	5/25	
6.	Provide further information regarding catenary line protection requirements and potential design options.	PL	6/22	
7.	Determine 6(f) resource designation for project.	PL and NPS	5/25	
8.				
9.				

## SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE

Decision #	Description	Decision Date	Concurring Agency/Party
1.	Use arched bridge configuration.	April 27, 2012	NPS
2.	Attach catenary lines to bridge.	April 27, 2012	NPS
3.	PL to prepare base document for NPS ROD.	April 27, 2012	NPS, PL

*These minutes reflect the author's understanding of the discussions at the meeting. The minutes shall initially be considered as draft and open to comments for a period of 5 business days after the date of initial issuance. If no comments are received within five days, these minutes shall be considered final and will be issued as such within 2 business days of the initial comment period. (Remove this note from final version of the meeting minutes)*

**Attachments:**

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)  
Agenda  
Previous meeting minutes  
Meeting Handouts

**Distribution:**

Attendees  
PL GEC Core Team  
PL DCT (PLdocumentcontrol@gfnet.com)





## ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Meeting Title  
4/27/12 10 AM

Name	Company	Phone Number	E-mail Address
Alex Romero	NPS- NACE	202-690-5197	alex_romero@nps.gov
Stephen Syphax	NPS- NACE	202-690-5160	Stephen_syphax@nps.gov
David Hayes	NPS-NCR	202-619-7277	David_Hayes@nps.gov
Charles Murphy	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	cmurphy@gfnet.com
Charlie Bailey	P/L GEC	410-235-6001	cbailey@mahanrykiel.com
Tobi Louse Kester	P/L GEC	410-302-0598	tkester@cemscience.com
Amanda Baxter	P/L GEC	443-848-6096	abaxter@swrallp.com
Harriet Levine	P/L GEC	410-230-6630	Harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Adam Stephenson	FTA	202-366-5183	Adam.stephenson@dot.gov
Dan Koenig	FTA	202-219-3525	Daniel.koenig@dot.gov
Matt Storck	P/L GEC	410-281-2935	Matthew.storck@stvinc.com
Steve Hawtof	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Makayah Royal	NPS- NACE	202-619-7092	Makayah_royal@nps.gov
Eric Harris	NPS- NACE-BWP	301-344-3948	Eric_harris@nps.gov
Fred Cunningham	NPS- NACE-BWP	301-344-3948	Fred_Cunningham@nps.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** NPS Coordination Meeting  
**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 6/22/2012  
**MEETING LOCATION:** NPS Office  
**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster  
**PREPARED BY:** Shonnell Gibson  
**DISTRIBUTION DATE:** 9/17/2012  
**DCN:** 2012.06.22.PM.PE.02.NPS Project Info. Mtg.6-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

- Introductions and Objectives of Meeting
- MOT Decision, Alternate 3
- Shielding Options continued from April Meeting
- Structure Ownership
- NEPA, Section 106 and 4(f) Discussion
- Permission to work within Parkway (MOU/Permit)
- 4 month look ahead
- Comments

### Discussion

1. NPS confirmed their choice for the MOT Alternate 3 option.
2. Future Meeting Schedule – for now it will stay on a monthly schedule, but there was mention of using WebEx for its visual capabilities and for the small agendas that may not require face-to-face meetings. This will be evaluated on a monthly basis.
3. NPS clear screen concern – if used, what would the horizontal clear screens look like in 3 years or so? Answer (per Jim Guinther ): it is a UV protected, Plexiglas-like material used with the intent that it never has to be cleaned (similar to what's used on Woodrow Wilson). Regarding Amanda's rust concern for the attachments, the metals would be galvanized and therefore corrosion inhibited.
4. The vertical shielding option does not go with the historical aspect, and would alter the view from the parkway, therefore the Park Service did not like the vertical options.
5. NPS prefers the horizontal options and the look of the full span shield option (lightly referred to as the David Hayes option). Cost has not yet been evaluated.
6. There is a general agreement that .6 acres of land will require a full property transfer (.5 along track and a .1 acre sliver where road pushes north just to the east of the parkway). **Transfers require approval.** The Federal Secretary of Transportation initiates the process. Brian Woodbury is best to shepherd everyone through this, however he is still out for another 4 weeks (health reasons). For now continue to go through Georgann Smale.

7. A temporary easement is required for 2.5 acres of land. NCPC only acts as an advisor concerning easements.
8. The official NCPC meetings are for summary purposes for the project and only allow for 10 minutes per topic, but they would like to have any considered renderings in the appendix for follow-up after the meeting. In the meantime, they will hold 2 or 3 meetings with their staff on 106, BW Parkway, and bridge typologies, and will invite David to all.
9. NCPC has a Historic Preservationist, Jennifer Hirsch, who should be involved in these conversations. If property is transferred to MTA, NCPC will have 106 responsibilities, and Jennifer would most likely be the contact for that as well. Mike will also connect her to David to help NCPC and NPS stay on the same page going forward.
10. Capper-Cramton concerns should also be included on the NCPC meeting agenda.
11. The section 106 effects report is in draft status and under internal review (per Kerri and John). It should be submitted next month. They are recommending that the PL has no adverse effect from the BW Pkwy standpoint (details from the meeting can be provided if necessary). David has a few concerns about that recommendation so conversations will be arranged before the next official NCPC meeting. In the proposal he would like to see a narrative documentation of changes and details of how much land would come back to NPS.
12. NPS had concerns that a DiMinimus finding equates to no compensation. Harriet clarified that it does not.
13. Regarding bridge ownership, NPS currently owns the bridge. After the proposed transfer of land and bridge design, NPS will still own the bridge. The catenary would be MTA property attaching directly to the bridge (for aesthetic reasons; to avoid adding poles). A maintenance agreement would be required, but there are no airspace issues to iron out as someone questioned.
14. NCPC upcoming review schedule – official meeting in July, concept comments should be ready for fall (October or November), preliminary approvals in the spring/summer, and final decisions in 2014.
15. Per Amanda, a sample DiMinimus letter format will be forwarded to Mike Weil. She would also like a clear list of the audience for DEIS and their contact information, a partial list of which includes NPS Regional East (David), NPS National, the cooperative agency under NEPA, the consulting parties of 106, and for the DiMinimus - Montgomery County.
16. Mike Weil will check previous meeting notes to determine who has authorization for DiMinimus sign-offs verses full project approval.
17. For future NPS scheduling please include Cultural Resources contact: makayal\_boyle@nps.gov

The next meeting will be held on 8/24/2012

### SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Forward historic documentation to Jennifer Hirsch (NCPC) for possible conference call early next week.	John Martin	7/3/2012	Complete
2.	Prepare renderings for the appendix for the official NCPC presentation meeting.	Harriet Levine	7/11/2012	Complete
3.	Include a visual narrative of changes in the effects report, as well as information on land possibly returned to NPS.	Steve Hawtof	11/15/2012	Ongoing
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

### SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE

Decision #	Description	Decision Date	Concurring Agency/Party
1.	MOT alternative 3 confirmed	June 22, 2012	NPS
2.	Use Horizontal shield, otherwise known as David Hayes Shield	June 22, 2012	NPS



**Attachments:**

Attendance Roster

Agenda

Meeting Handouts

**Distribution:**

Attendees

PL GEC Core Team

PL DCT (e-mail address to be provided by J. Boyer)

**ATTENDANCE ROSTER  
MEETING DATE AND TIME**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Stephen Syphax	NPS, NCP-East	202-690-5160	Stephen_Syphax@nps.gov
David Hayes (via phone)	NPS, NCR	202-713-8420	David_hayes@nps.gov
Amanda Baxter	NEPA/Purple Line	443-848-6096	abaxter@wrallp.com
Adam Stephenson	FTA HQ	202-366-5183	Adam.stephenson@dot.gov
Harriet Levine	Purple Line Team	410-230-6630	harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Michael Weil	NCPC	202-482-7253	Michael.weil@ncpc.gov
Jim Guinther	Purple Line Team	443-224-1583	jguinther@wrallp.com
Charles Murphy	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	cmurphy@gfnet.com
Steve Hawtof	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Shonnell Gibson	Purple Line Team	410-244-6046	sgibson@diveng.com
John W. Martin	PL/GEC	856-802-9930	jmartin@gfnet.com
Kerri Barile	PL/GEC	540-899-9170	kbarile@dovetailorg.com
Tim Lidiak (via phone)	FTA		Timothy.lidiak@dot.gov
Gopaul Noojibail (5 minute preview)	NPS		Gopauul_Noojibail@nps.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING SUBJECT:** National Park Service Project Information Meeting

**MEETING DATE, TIME:** 8/24/2012 10:00 am

**MEETING LOCATION:** National Capital Parks – East, 1900 Anacostia Drive, Washington, DC

**ATTENDEES:** See attached Attendance Roster

**PREPARED BY:** Steven Hawtof

**DISTRIBUTION DATE:**

**DCN:** 2012.08.24.PM.PE.02.NPS Project Info. Mtg.7-FINAL

---

### Meeting Initiation/Purpose

The Federal Transit administration (FTA), National Parks Service (NPS), and Purple Line team (PL) met to discuss a) Section 106, b) Section 4(f) *de minimus*, c) Special Use permit requirements for engineering phase field activities, and d) verify catenary shield protection selection

### Discussion

1. A lengthy discussion occurred in regard to the Section 106 evaluation. John Martin described the process by which a Determination of Eligibility (DOE) was prepared for the Parkway Structure and sent to the MD Historic Trust (MHT). He indicated that the analysis indicated no adverse effect and the current structure is a non-contributing element since the structures were rebuilt in 1995. He indicated that MHT would review the DOE and determine if they agree with our findings. Jim Rosenstock had a number of comments including his belief that the existing structure did have contributing elements and also thought that there would be an adverse effect. David Hayes also said he was not convinced that it was non-contributing. Jim also indicated that he thought that MTA was advancing to quickly without proper consultation with NPS and asked if NPS cultural has been part of the process. Steve Hawtof indicated that we have been meeting monthly with NPS and they have been working with MTA on this process. He indicated that NPS's cultural person attended one meeting but left this district. David Hayes indicated that he would seek out a cultural resources person on staff who will be part of the process.

David was concerned that the DOE wasn't shared with NPS at the same time as MHT. Steve indicated that NPS was a consulting party and would have the opportunity to review and comment on the eligibility of their resource. In the meantime, John Martin distributed a hard copy of the DOE and indicated that he would send out a PDF to David Hayes who will distribute it to the appropriate people including NCPC.

David and Steve also agreed that there should be a separate call or meeting with the NPS cultural resource person in the next few weeks prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

It was agreed that there was still a ways to go in the process of determination of eligibility and that NPS would talk to MHT to discuss their concerns.

2. Harriet Levine briefed the group on where in the process we were with the Section 4(f) determination. First, she showed a map that indicated that there would be approximately 0.6 acres of permanent impact to the Parkway. She also thoroughly explained that there would be a need for approximately 7.5 to 8.0 acres of

temporary impact. The temporary impact would be for temporary construction of such things as maintaining traffic while the bridges were being constructed to a staging area for a crane to sit when constructing the new bridges. Harriet explained how the resource would be mitigated to provide landscaping such as trees and bushes in the disturbed areas. This mitigation plan would be developed with input from NPS.

David Hayes asked if anyone from NPS Real Property has been contacted. Steve noted that Rob Loskot of the PMC has started a dialogue with Elizabeth Smale and Brian Woodbury.

Harriet next explained the Section 4(f) process and described the definition for a *de minimus* finding. She indicated that there would be potentially two findings of *di minimus*, one for 106 and one for 4(f). Jim indicated that he felt there could not be a *di minimus* finding due to the impact to the Parkway; however, Harriet disagreed since the future state of the parkway and the experience when construction is complete would be relatively the same as it is today. They agreed to disagree and allow the process to move forward for this determination. The GEC indicated that whether a *di minimus* determination was approved or not, we would still provide the same level of structure design and mitigation for the resource. The team wanted to stress that the process would be slightly changed if a complete 4(f) evaluation was warranted.

Dan Koenig indicated that another review would be completed by the DOI in addition to the local review.

3. The next presentation concerned what was required to obtain a Special Use permit from the Park Service. Matt Storck gave a presentation on the survey needs and indicated that there would be some need for lane closures when surveying on and near the Parkway. He showed standard plates for lane closures and got agreement that these would be sufficient. Alex Romero indicated that we would need to work with the NPS Park Police, that they would need a force account and that advanced press releases indicating lane closures would be needed.

Jim Guinther next presented the boring plan and indicated that there would also be a need for lane closures.

Jim Rosenstock indicated that if the operation would last more than a day, a different and more stringent requirement would be needed with MHT. Jim Guinther indicated that these operations should last 1 day.

When asked what we needed to state in the letter for the permit, Jim Rosenstock indicated that he would like to keep the requirements general in nature so a 5 year permit could be issued. At the time of survey or other activities, we could then reach out to NPS and be more specific. Steve indicated that we would send a draft letter for his review/ concurrence prior to sending in an official letter.

4. The next 4 meeting dates were reviewed and confirmed as acceptable for all parties: May 25<sup>th</sup>, June 22<sup>nd</sup>, July 27, and August 24.

The next meeting will be held on 5/25/2012.



## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item #	Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1.	Provide before and after photo simulations at NB and SB ramps showing MOT Alt. 3 and MOT Alt. 4 with walls.	PL	5/25	
2.	Provide PL with decision on preferred MOT Alternative by May 3, 2012.	NPS	5/14	
3.	Provide additional details of structures and configurations as pre-TS&L design progresses.	PL	Ongoing	
4.	Determine ownership of bridges and parties involved in maintenance agreements.	PL	5/25	
5.	Verify internal determinations of ownership and maintenance on bridges.	NPS	5/25	
6.	Provide further information regarding catenary line protection requirements and potential design options.	PL	6/22	
7.	Determine 6(f) resource designation for project.	PL and NPS	5/25	
8.				
9.				

## SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE

Decision #	Description	Decision Date	Concurring Agency/Party
1.	Use arched bridge configuration.	April 27, 2012	NPS
2.	Attach catenary lines to bridge.	April 27, 2012	NPS
3.	PL to prepare base document for NPS ROD.	April 27, 2012	NPS, PL

*These minutes reflect the author's understanding of the discussions at the meeting. The minutes shall initially be considered as draft and open to comments for a period of 5 business days after the date of initial issuance. If no comments are received within five days, these minutes shall be considered final and will be issued as such within 2 business days of the initial comment period. (Remove this note from final version of the meeting minutes)*

**Attachments:**

Attendance Roster (Scanned Original)  
Agenda  
Previous meeting minutes  
Meeting Handouts

**Distribution:**

Attendees  
PL GEC Core Team  
PL DCT (PLdocumentcontrol@gfnet.com)



## ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Meeting Title  
8/24/12 10 AM

Name	Company	Phone Number	E-mail Address
Alex Romero	NPS- NACE	202-690-5197	alex_romero@nps.gov
David Hayes (By Phone)	NPS-NCR	202-619-7277	David_Hayes@nps.gov
Amanda Baxter (By Phone)	P/L GEC	443-848-6096	abaxter@swrallp.com
Harriet Levine (By Phone)	P/L GEC	410-230-6630	Harriet.levine@jacobs.com
Adam Stephenson	FTA	202-366-5183	Adam.stephenson@dot.gov
Dan Koenig (By Phone)	FTA	202-219-3525	Daniel.koenig@dot.gov
Matt Storck	P/L GEC	410-281-2935	Matthew.storck@stvinc.com
Steve Hawtof	P/L GEC	443-348-2017	shawtof@gfnet.com
Jim Rosenstock	NPS- NACE	202-619-7092	james_rosenstock@nps.gov
Jim Guinther	P/L GEC		jguinther@wrallp.com
Mike Weil	NCPC		mweil@ncpc.org
John Martin	P/L GEC		jmartin@gfnet.com
Tim Lidiak (By Phone)	FTA		Timothy.Lidiak@dot.gov



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REGION III  
Delaware, District of  
Columbia, Maryland,  
Pennsylvania, Virginia,  
West Virginia

1760 Market Street  
Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4124  
215-656-7100  
215-656-7260 (fax)

December 8, 2011

Mr. David Hayes  
National Park Service  
Regional Transportation Liaison  
National Capital Region of NPS  
1100 Ohio Drive, SW  
Washington, DC 20242

Subject: Purple Line, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties  
Section 4(f) Resources – Baltimore Washington Parkway

Dear Mr. Hayes:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), is preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Purple Line transit project located in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland. The purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with the National Park Service to begin formal coordination regarding the Purple Line project and its potential effects on the Baltimore Washington Parkway.

The Purple Line would extend 16 miles, from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton, in Prince George's County. The Purple Line would connect Metrorail's Red Line (Bethesda and Silver Spring stations), Green Line (College Park station), and Orange Line (New Carrollton station). This project would provide transit options to people along the corridor, support economic development, and help address the region's air quality issues.

The attached map shows the Purple Line alignment, as well as park resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. As currently designed, the Purple Line would follow Riverdale Road (MD 410) under the Baltimore Washington Parkway (MD 295). The project would include widening along Riverdale Road within the Park's boundary and would require the reconstruction of the Parkway bridges in this area to accommodate the wider roadway/transit section.

As part of the coordination effort, we would like to request any relevant, available information on the Baltimore Washington Parkway, such as Parkway Master Plans, funding information, and history of the parkway that might be beneficial with regard to our research of this resource.

Please contact Tim Lidiak, FTA Environmental Planner (215-656-7084) or John Newton, MTA's Environmental Manager (410-767-3769) at your convenience to schedule the meeting.

We appreciate your assistance with this process.

Sincerely,



Michele Destra, Director  
Office of Planning & Program Development

Enclosure

cc: Gayle Hazelwood, B/W Parkway Superintendent  
George Choubah, PE, EFL Bridge Inspection  
Mike Madden, MTA  
John Newton, MTA  
Leslie Roche, PMC  
Steve Hawtof, GEC  
Amanda Baxter, GEC